DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 339 HE 023 532

AUTHOR Hoffacker, Bruce; Wolfe, Ethyle R.
TITLE The Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y. Brooklyn Coll.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT G008730489
NOTE 246p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty Development; *General Education; Higher Education; Inservice Education; Liberal Arts; Organizational Development; *Seminars; State Universities; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS City University of New York Brooklyn College

ABSTRACT

In 1987, Brooklyn College (New York) implemented the Center for Core Studies as a one-year experiment. The Center included three programs: the Visitors Program, the Summer Associates Program, and the Associates-in-Residence Program. participants from 40 institutions to the campus for 2-day visits. The Summer Associates Program brought 12 alumni of the Visitors Program back to the campus to participate in the college's 3-day summer Faculty Development Seminar and in 2 additional days of workshops focusing on issues of concern to their institutions. The Associates-in-Residence Program brought five visitors for a residential seminar of full immersion in the core process and active participation in the weekly Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning. Evaluation indicated that there is a pressing need for such a center, one that provides on-site participation including a graduated series of immersions and administrative support. Major attachments include: listings of Visitors Program participants and program agenda; the agenda of the Faculty Development Seminar; a record of the proceedings and decisions of the Core Faculty Development Seminar; report of a summer associates' (Manuel Schonhorn) on the Faculty Development Seminar; an outline of the Provost's Seminar; and a report on the Associates-in-Residence-Program and the Summer Associates Program. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319339

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

OF THE

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Grant No. G008730489

Project Dates: Starting Date: September 1, 1987
Ending Date: August 31, 1988
Number of Months: 12

Project Directors:

Ethyle R. Wolfe
Provost and Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York 11210
(718)780-5202

Bruce Hoffacker
Assistant to the Provost
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York 11210
(718)780-5847

Fund Program Officer: David Holmes

Grant Award: $81,000

HE 023 532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Project Summary

During 1987-88, Brooklyn College offered an experimental Center for Core Studies. The Center offered three programs: two-day Visitors Programs for 49 visitors representing 40 institutions; the Summer Associates Program in which 12 colleagues joined our 3-day summer Faculty Development Seminar and participated in two additional days dedicated to their institution's issues; and the Associates-in-Residence Program which brought 5 colleagues for one semester of full immersion in the core process and teaching as well as in a weekly Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning. Each program, in and of itself, was judged by participants as a complete success, meeting their needs beyond their expectations. More importantly, however, the national need for a participatory Center for Core Studies was demonstrated in a dramatic fashion and enthusiastically endorsed.

The Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College
Executive Summary

Brooklyn College of the City University of New York
Bedford Avenue and Avenue H
Brooklyn, New York 11210

Contact: Bruce Hoffacker
Office of the Provost
(718) 780-5847

Project Overview

In fall 1987, Brooklyn College implemented the proposed Center for Core Studies as a one-year experiment. The Center included three funded programs: the Visitors Program, the Summer Associates Program, and the Associates-in-Residence Program. The Visitors Program brought 49 selected participants from 40 institutions to the campus for two-day visits. The Summer Associates Program brought 12 alumni of the Visitors Program back to the campus to participate in the college's three-day summer Faculty Development Seminar and in two additional days of workshops directed to issues of concern to their institutions. The Associates-in-Residence Program brought five visitors for a residential seminar of full immersion in the core process and active participation in the weekly Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning.

Purpose

The purpose of the experimental Center for Core Studies was to test the validity of sustained urgings from institutions across the country that the college provide a resource for sharing its expertise on reforming general education.

Background and Origins

The primary impetus for the Center for Core Studies came from our 1984-87 Visitors Programs. During those three years, 104 colleagues representing 84 institutions visited the campus for intensive two-day programs. As part of each Visitors Program, an exit interview was conducted with each participant. It was in these interviews that the idea for a Center first surfaced. Visiting colleagues invariably requested more extensive participatory experiences and argued not only the need to propagate the supportive vehicle Brooklyn College was developing but the singular appropriateness of Brooklyn College to serve as clearinghouse and center for general education curriculum and faculty development efforts. In the exit interviews of later programs we deliberately tested the Center concept by positing the various programs we were considering, and participants urged us to seek the means to implement all of them.

Project Description

The Visitors Program. The diversity of institutions considering revision of their general education requirements was reflected in the 40 institutions representing private universities, large public institutions, small private colleges, branches of state university systems, sectarian colleges, and community colleges. The geographical scope of the program continues to be national.

One significant sequel to the Visitors Program should be noted. In many cases, the dialogue that begins in the Visitors Program continues after the participants leave the campus. While requests for additional information, advice, and reports on successes and failures are regularly received, subsequent requests for the Provost or Brooklyn faculty to visit as consultants are not uncommon. These requests for additional assistance are the best proof of the effectiveness of the Visitors Program as a starting point and demonstrate that need exists for more extensive services in institutions attempting to launch, implement, or revise foundational programs. Brooklyn College has made every effort to provide follow-up services and strategies wherever possible and appropriate.

The Summer Associates Program. The new Program that proved to be most successful and most rewarding beyond all expectation was the Summer Associates Program. The combination of Brooklyn College faculty and visitors in the college's regular three-day intensive Seminar that formed the central component of the Summer Associates Program proved to have priceless benefits for both groups.

On Monday, June 6, 1988, we welcomed 12 Summer Associates to Brooklyn College. After four faculty chairs of successive core committees addressed the most frequent question Brooklyn College receives concerning how it went about developing a core, the participants moved quickly into workshops dedicated to their institutions. The afternoon focus was on characteristics of a core course, drawing on the models used in visitors' institutions as well as the Brooklyn College experience.

The Associates spent the next three days as full participants in the college's summer Core Faculty Development Seminar. The membership of the Seminar included 12 Associates, 63 Brooklyn College faculty, and 10 students representing the Peer Tutoring Center. For each session that included a workshop, the Associates were divided among the 10 groups. The workshop participants were rotated, so that each Associate was able to work with a minimum of 30 Brooklyn College faculty in small group sessions. The final day for the Associates was devoted to a critical issue in any curricular reform, evaluation.

The Associates-in-Residence Program. The Associates-in-Residence Program represents our most ambitious effort. This program was designed for colleagues seeking a full immersion in the core process through a residential semester. The necessary lead time to plan such a program was of critical consequence. The timing of the FIPSE award and the limitation of a one-year effort left our invitees with little time to generate necessary administrative support and to make the extensive personal arrangements necessary for such a program. Our initial solicitation, despite the short lead time, generated the five eager participants projected. Extensive negotiations with provosts and deans were required in most cases. Three early confirmations were from the University of Bridgeport, LaGuardia Community College, and Suffolk Community College. In the fourth case, LeMoyne-Owen College (Memphis), extensive time was required to make appropriate local arrangements. In the fifth case, a last-minute cancellation allowed us to honor an outstanding request from the Provost of a CUNY institution for the participation of the key faculty member of its curriculum committee in the Provost's weekly Seminar that was part of the

Program. We were pleased to cover the span of four-year and two-year colleges and a United Negro College Fund institution.

The different responsibilities and agenda of the Associates resulted in designing individual programs at Brooklyn College for each. While it would have been easier to plan a standard program for all participants, it quickly became clear that each Associate needed flexibility to pursue his/her own objectives. In a majority of cases, core teaching was a part of that program. Some of the five Associates, who were near enough to their home institutions, were fortunately able to maintain a regular liaison with activities related to ongoing curriculum decisions on their campuses. In our proposal, we expressed our concern about finding a mechanism to keep the Associates in contact with work in progress at their home institutions, but did not envision that administrators would be calling on them in emergencies and want to have these key faculty regularly informed and even involved in ongoing developments.

The centerpiece of the Associates-in-Residence Program was the Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning. This Seminar matched the five Associates with five Brooklyn College colleagues plus invited guests to discuss definitions and goals of general education as well as specific institutional needs identified by Associates. The Seminar met weekly throughout the semester. In anticipation of the first session, a working "syllabus" was prepared that provided a proposed structure for the sessions, subject to revision at the will of the constituents. By the end of the semester, the outline had been fully covered.

Evaluation

Each of the three Center programs had its own evaluation procedure. Since the Visitors Program represented the continuation of a program which had been rigorously evaluated in the preceeding years, there was no need to engage in a formal evaluation as part of this initiative. A final consultation with each visitor solicited comments on the specific elements in the program. For the Summer Associates Program, we requested that each Associate write, after leaving the campus, an evaluation which reflected how the program met his or her expectations. The responses were overwhelmingly positive in terms of the program exceeding expectations and inspiring them to return to their campus renewed and equipped for immediate action. An outside consultant also participated in the summer Seminar and evaluated the Associates-in-Residence Program. A summation of his evaluation can be found in the following comment from his report, "I strongly endorse the formation of (and support for) a Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College."

Summary and Conclusions

The most salient conclusion of our experimental year is that the need for such a Center for Core Studies exists and is pressing. Our experience indicates that proactive reform requires a national Center that provides on-sight participation in a well-tested core process, that it must offer a graduated series of immersions, and that it must have the administrative support necessary to ensure its viability as a continuing entity. Brooklyn College was pleased to have had the opportunity to continue its history of service to other institutions through the experimental Center and, in light of its demonstrated impact, is prepared to consider the permanent establishment of such a Center on our campus.

THE CENTER FOR CORE STUDIES AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

Introduction

When we submitted the proposal for a one-year experimental Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College, we were aware that what we were asking FIPSE to support was a unique enterprise, directed as it was toward providing a much-needed and widely-solicited service to institutions across the nation. In lieu of requesting funds for one of the initiatives that remain on our own core's agenda, we proffered the expertise, time, and energy of our faculty to meet the accumulated requests for expanded on-site participation in our process of curricular reform. The effectiveness of the program and its impact leave no room for questioning the altruistic impulse that generated the grant proposal to FIPSE.

In fall 1987, Brooklyn College implemented the proposed Center for Core Studies. At the conclusion of this funded experimental year, we can report that the Center was judged a dramatic success both by the participating institutions and the external evaluation. Our experience indicates that: there is a need for such a national Center devoted to strengthening general education curricula; the format for the programs of such an Institute must be participatory -- participants must be directly involved in faculty and curriculum development in ways that are transferable to their home campus; there must be an array of programs to meet the variety of needs of institutions at different stages of the curriculum development process; an administrative infrastructure must exist to handle the myriad of details involved in such an undertaking. The single factor, beyond the College's core curriculum, that has made the experiment such a success is the

willingness of Brooklyn College faculty and administrators to make themselves available to visitors for candid analyses of the strengths and limitations of the Brooklyn College experience and the potential for adapting elements of our model in other settings. Our keen awareness that each institution must develop its own consensus on the scope and content of its general education requirement has led to regular, interactive dialogues which have continued long after the individual programs have concluded.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the program was the fact that it was scheduled to run for one year. The invitations to participate in the Summer Associates and Associates-in-Residence Programs were sent to alumni of Visitors Programs conducted over the previous three years. However when these programs came to the attention of participants in the 1987-88 Visitors Program, they expressed their eagerness to participate in the Center's new and more intensive activities. While we were able to accommodate a few such requests, the lead time necessary to handle applications and arrange the week-long seminar or the semester-in-residence precluded applications from most 1987-88 visitors. They were dismayed to learn that the intensive programs would not be offered in subsequent years since we had only applied to FIPSE for a one-year trial and had not taken into account that the October deadline for reapplication would practically coincide with the onset of the one-year experiment. This disappointment has been compounded during the current fall as invited presentations by the Project Director, Ethyle R. Wolfe, have generated new interest in Brooklyn College's approach to curricular reform.

This report will describe the three programs funded as part of the experimental Center: the Visitors Programs; the Summer Associates Program; and the Associates-in-Residence Program.

The Visitors Program

The Visitors Program continues to generate nationwide interest. The 1987-88 year was the fourth year Brooklyn College has offered such programs. The proposal called for the program to accommodate 24 colleagues in three two-day sessions. In fact, the 1987-88 program involved 49 colleagues representing 40 institutions in sessions in October, November, and March (the list of participants can be found in Attachment A). This brings the three-year total to 153 participants representing 124 institutions, and a backlog of institutions requesting information on the core curriculum still exists.

The participants continue to reflect the diversity of institutions considering revision of their general education requirements. Represented among the 40 institutions were private institutions (e.g., Adelphi University), large public institutions (e.g., University of California, Los Angeles), small private colleges (e.g., Wilkes College), branches of state university systems (e.g., University of Minnesota, Duluth), sectarian colleges (e.g., Saint Merniad College), and community colleges (e.g., Massachusetts Bay Community College). The geographical scope of the program continues to be national with institutions as far away as California, Louisiana, and Wisconsin, joining Northeastern states such as Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

The program that was used for each of the three sessions was based on the model presented in our proposal, and the details need not be repeated here (the three 1987-88 programs are appended as Attachment B). We continue to offer the visitors a history of the Brooklyn College core curriculum development and implementation process, opportunities to observe faculty development activities through direct participation, time for discussion of

the visitors' institutions, issues confronting their faculty, and general questions. In the first two years of the program, the final session culminated in an evaluation of the program in which a Brooklyn College representative would question each participant about individual elements in the two-day program to assist in the refinement of the agenda. After two years of unexceptionally superlative reactions to the program, we no longer felt the need to conduct such an intensive evaluation and that session is now a final consultation in which a Brooklyn College representative discusses with the visitor what will be occurring at his or her campus in the near future in a one-on-one setting. This provides the opportunity for very specific attention to the next steps that might be taken in a variety of different situations. In many cases, Brooklyn College representatives have been able to offer advice which has led to new approaches during the subsequent months. The appropriateness of elements of the program may also be discussed in these consultations, and the feedback continues to be enormously positive.

One follow-up to the Visitors Program should be noted. In many cases, the dialogue that begins in the Visitors Program continues after the participants leave the campus. Requests for additional information, advice, and reports on successes and failures are regularly received in this office. These contacts have led to requests for Brooklyn representatives to visit some campuses as consultants. These requests for additional assistance indicate the need that exists for more extensive services in institutions attempting to strengthen their foundational liberal arts programs, and Brooklyn College has sought to provide services wherever possible and appropriate.

The Summer Associates Program

The new Program that proved to be most successful and most rewarding beyond all expectation was the Summer Associates Program. The combination of Brooklyn College faculty and visitors in the three-day intensive Seminar that formed the central component of the Summer Associates Program proved to have priceless benefits for both groups. The reaction to the experience from our faculty has indicated that the visitors asked penetrating questions that required fundamental rethinking of our approach to resolving some of our own core issues. For the visitors, the experience proved a tonic for those who despaired of the very possibility of having faculty across the disciplines work together on curricular reform, and they left convinced that the experience could be replicated on their home campus and armed with a process and tools to implement it.

The Summer Associates Program cannot be understood without some background on the College's summer Faculty Development Seminar. The Seminar, held each June since 1982, brings together faculty from core and non-core departments to discuss a specific set of propositions about the core curriculum which examine either its content or teaching strategies. The three-day intensive experiences, which are planned in great detail in weekly meetings during the spring semester, have had a dramatic impact on our faculty and have resulted in significant changes in the core curriculum. More importantly, the issues raised in the Seminars have become part of the agenda for the College's Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum during the subsequent year. The process of interactive dialogue between colleagues has become the hallmark of our core process and has set the stage for other faculty development activities during the academic year.

The Faculty Development Seminar normally involves 50-60 Brooklyn College participants, primarily drawn from faculty who teach in the core, but recently including representatives of non-core disciplines. In 1986 and 1987, we invited selected students from our new Core Peer Tutoring Project for individual sessions of the Seminar. For the 1988 Seminar, ten students were invited as full participants. Consequently, when combined with the Summer Associates, we added two new groups to the program model that had worked so successfully for seven years. In almost all aspects, the results exceeded our expectations.

Planning for the involvement of the Summer Associates began as soon as the award was received in fall, 1987, when letters were sent to alumni of three years of Visitors Programs inviting them to apply for both the Summer and Associates-in-Residence Program. We were heartened at the response to this invitation. In view of the fact that a number of individuals had changed institutions since they had attended the Visitors Program, that the program would take place only once, and despite the drawbacks of requiring the participant's institution to cover travel and some per diem expenses for a full week at Brooklyn College plus travel time, the response was very encouraging. Although the FIPSE award called for 15 Summer Associates, we invited 18, anticipating that changes in schedule from November to June would probably result in some invitees being unable to attend. We reconfirmed with the invitees in April and, indeed, our estimates were correct, and 15 colleagues were scheduled to attend. Due to illness and last-minute schedule changes, 12 participants finally attended the week-long Seminar in June.

In preparation for each summer Seminar, a planning committee meets throughout the spring semester on a weekly basis. The 1988 planning

committee was charged with preparing the schedule for the three-day session as well as responsibility for designing the program of the introductory day for visitors and the final visitors session, after the three-day Seminar concluded. To insure that our planning efforts included a visitors' perspective, we invited one of the Associates-in-Residence to serve on the committee. Professor Thomas Juliusburger (University of Bridgeport) was included both for his own insight into the types of issues that should be discussed in the seminar and as a sounding-board representing colleagues from other institutions to help insure that they could be fully involved in the experience. Professor Juliusburger was assigned the task of drafting the final plans for the two days designed especially for the visitors, and his comments on the main seminar program helped keep issues clearly in focus. It is one of our conclusions that, if the Summer Associates Program is to continue, we must find a way to include in the planning process a colleague from outside the college to insure that a "visitors' perspective" is part of the planning.

The planning process resulted in a five-day program that is detailed in Attachment C. The program reflects a well-tested process of plenaries and workshops focused on specific problems that has worked so successfully in the evolution of our core curriculum. The visitors' introductory day was designed with the knowledge that the visitors had previously participated in a two-day Visitors Program at Brooklyn College and had a working knowledge of the curriculum and our core process. (In two cases, Summer Associates had not attended a visitors program, although colleagues from their institutions had; in both cases they had recently been elected to the curriculum committees of their colleges. Preliminary indoctrination to the

program in advance of their attendance allowed us to move directly into deep waters without devoting any time to background briefings.)

On Monday, June 6, 1988, the Planning Committee welcomed 12 Summer Associates to Brooklyn College (the names and affiliations of the Associates are listed in Attachment C). After a short welcome by Provost Ethyle R. Wolfe, project director, the participants moved quickly into considering the most frequent question that Brooklyn College receives: how did you go about developing a core? (Sometimes cast in the form of how did you ever get your faculty to agree on a common core.) To start the discussion, short presentations by four chairs of our Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum covered the design and implementation phases of our program up to the current year. This allowed the Associates to observe the evolution of the curriculum and the changing agenda confronting the Committee charged with overseeing this curriculum. The group then broke into workshops, each with two Brooklyn College faculty and four Associates. The reports of the workshops are detailed in Attachment D. The afternoon did not rely on workshops, but rather the full group met to discuss characteristics of a core course, drawing on the models used in visitors' institutions as well as the Brooklyn College experience.

For the next three days, the Associates joined our summer Faculty Development Seminar as full participants. The membership of the Seminar included the 12 Associates, 63 Brooklyn College faculty, and 10 students representing the Peer Tutoring Project. Included in the Brooklyn College faculty were the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the two Associate Deans of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Graduate Studies, all of whom participated in the Seminar in the capacity of core teachers. The full

program will not be detailed here (it can be found in Attachment D). For each session that included a workshop, the Associates were divided among the 10 groups. The workshop participants were rotated, so that each Associate was able to work with a minimum of 30 Brooklyn College faculty in small group sessions (the individual workshop assignments and reports are also found in Attachment D).

The final day for the Associates was devoted to a critical issue in any curricular reform, evaluation. The Associates heard a tape of a speech by Brooklyn College President Robert L. Hess given at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges on "Program Failures and Successes." Those comments were supposed to set the stage for workshops on evaluation, but the group decided to stay together to continue the discussions that had started. Two informal presentations were heard: one on emerging state evaluation requirements across the country, and one on the Brooklyn College core curriculum evaluation effort. This discussion continued straight through lunch and into the final afternoon session which served as a forum for questions that had not been addressed in the preceding four and one-half days.

We recognized that conventional evaluation techniques would not capture the essence of an experience such as the one the Associates engaged in. They come with a variety of expectations and from institutions that are at different points in the core development process. Consequently, rather than attempt to develop an evaluation questionnaire which would cover the variety of experiences, we decided to allow the Associates to speak for themselves. We requested that, after returning to their home campus, they write their impressions and evaluation of the program. The responses received are

included in Attachment E, but some short quotes can serve to give the overall sense of accomplishment which grew out of the Seminar experience.

From my visitor's perspective, these three days were far more valuable than all the canned presentations and articles I have been exposed to by institutions ballyhooing their new general education programs.

While my participation as a summer associate... yielded many valuable practical suggestions to enrich the Humanities Program at Marymount College, my most rewarding experiences were less tangible: sensing the strength of collegiality among faculty... peer tutors, and visitors: the openness to discussion and subsequent change: the college-wide enthusiasm and concern for the core.

As a visitor, I especially appreciated both the collegiality and the candor of the participating Brooklyn College faculty, staff, and students ....this observer (a faculty member for almost 25 years) was especially impressed by the openness with which problems were discussed and the pervasive positive spirit which most participants brought to the process.

When I first visited Brooklyn College - the fall of 1986... I thought the faculty must be extraordinary; unlike faculty at my or any other institution... When I returned... however, I realized that the Brooklyn College faculty are, indeed, like faculty at my institution and elsewhere. In fact, as I sat through the session, the positions were strikingly, almost frighteningly, similar to those I have heard at my present institution and at other institutions where I have worked ...I learned that hard work, commitment and a shared vision can result in a coherent undergraduate program.

The Associates-in-Residence Program

The Associates-in-Residence Program represents our most ambitious effort. This program was designed for colleagues seeking a full immersion in the core process through a residential semester. Naturally, such a commitment requires substantial advance planning and a major commitment from the institution to fund a semester with no teaching responsibilities for that faculty member. The advantage that accrues from such an arrangement is that there must be a serious administrative commitment to the goals of the program for such arrangements to be made.

The necessary lead time to plan such a program was of critical consequence. The timing of the FIPSE award and the limitation of a one-year

effort left our invitees with little time to generate necessary administrative support and to make the extensive personal arrangements necessary for such a program. Given the time constraint, not having to make housing arrangements for three of the five associates diminished the personal dislocations associated with a residence semester and had the tremendously positive attribute of allowing the participants to maintain some presence on their own campus even while involved in the Brooklyn College experience.

Our initial solicitation, despite the short lead time, generated five colleagues, as projected, who were interested in participating in the program. However, one highly disappointed colleague tried desperately but was unable to make the necessary administrative arrangements to complete an agreement at the last moment. Extensive negotiations with provosts and deans were required in three cases, and in the final case, the original expression of interest was from the President of the institution so that one set of hurdles was easily surmounted. Three early confirmations were from the University of Bridgeport, LaGuardia Community College, and Suffolk Community College. In the fourth case, LeMoyne-Owen College (Memphis), local arrangements required extensive time to secure appropriate housing and child-care arrangements. After his Provost vetoed the leave of the fifth participant from Northern Illinois, Provost Wolfe contacted the Provost of another CUNY institution who had long sought assistance in persuading a recalcitrant faculty to reform their general education with the result that a faculty member was released from one course to attend the Provost's Seminar that was part of the Program, but she was not "in residence" for the semester. We were pleased to cover the span of four-year and two-year colleges and a United Negro College Fund institution.

The timing of the program left us with one other administrative difficulty. As part of the Associates-in-Residence program, it was intended that the participants teach a Core Studies course in their discipline. The fact that scheduling and teaching assignments at Brooklyn College are completed by the end of October and that negotiations were not completed with the Associates until well after that time presented a serious obstacle for fitting them into the teaching schedule. (It should also be noted that departmental appointments committees wished to review the curricula vitae of Associates before permitting them to teach in the department, a process which took additional time.) The issue was resolved in three cases through the addition of new sections of Core Studies courses to the schedule, and thus the opportunity to teach in the Core Curriculum was provided. In the fourth case, it was judged to be in the best interest of the guest institutuion to allow the participant to spend the full semester observing and participating in a core course in a related field in which there was need to strengthen instruction on his own campus.

After the delays and negotiations, we began the spring semester with five Associates as projected in the original proposal. Each had come to Brooklyn with very particular issues to address at his or her home campus:

> Professor Richard Fox, Suffolk Community College. (History) Suffolk is a three-campus institution with distinct faculties and missions in each case. A group of faculty is attempting to overcome major obstacles in developing a common core curriculum that would span the campuses. That group has been working to generate both administrative and broader faculty support for the concept.
>
> Professor Thomas Juliusburger, University of Bridgeport. (History) Professor Juliusburger is a co-coordinator of the required program of senior seminars at Bridgeport and is seeking to strengthen the lower-division general education requirements.
>
> Professor Betsy Gitter, John Jay College of Criminal Justice. (English) Professor Gitter was recommended by her Provost and

was only able to attend the Provost's Seminar. In a pre-professional, specialized school, strengthening general education requirements is a difficult process. A Provost's Task Force had been working on curriculum reform but was stymied by turf questions congenital to instituting a common program.

Professor Joanne Reitano, LaGuardia Community College (History). Professor Reitano chairs the Liberal Arts and Sciences Task Force which is attempting to revise the general education requirements at LaGuardia. The Task Force, in an institution known for its cooperative education program, is constructing a proposal which will include some common requirements and some distribution options.

Professor Sandra Vaughn, LeMoyne-Owen College (Political Science). Professor Sandra Vaughn was sent to Brooklyn College by the new President. She is chair of the Faculty Senate and central to the curriculum revision process on her campus. During the semester, she took on responsibility for working on developmental programs and brought a contingent of LeMoyne-Owen faculty to Brooklyn for a two-day visit to study approaches to developmental education.

The first organized event for the Associates-in-Residence was an orientation session which occurred in January, before the start of the Brooklyn College spring semester. This luncheon session outlined the goals for the Program and reviewed the status of each Associate's institution. This session was critical for the Associates who would not meet again until after the semester had started and teaching had begun.

The different responsibilities and agenda of the Associates resulted in designing individual programs at Brooklyn College for each. While we might have planned a standard program for all participants, it quickly became clear that each Associate needed flexibility to pursue his/her own objectives. Some of the five Associates, who were near enough to their home institution, were fortunately able to continue some regular activities related to ongoing curriculum decisions, a feature not anticipated in our original design for the semester. While these obligations put additional burden on them, there was the advantage of keeping developments on the home

campus at the center of our discussions. In our proposal, we expressed our concern about finding a mechanism to keep the Associates in contact with work-in-progress at their home institutions, but did not envision that administrators would be calling on them in emergencies and want to have these key faculty regularly informed and even involved in ongoing activities.

The programs of the individual Associates can be summarized as follows:

Professor Richard Fox. Professor Fox taught one section of Core Studies 4 (The Shaping of the Modern World). Professor Fox spent one day each week at Suffolk Community College where he participated in a Task Force which is working on general education issues. At Brooklyn College, Professor Fox engaged in a series of interviews with faculty involved in the preparation of our core proposal to focus on the substance and consensus-building necessary to get a proposal adopted, which is a chief hurdle for a three-campus institution.

Professor Thomas Juliusburger. Professor Juliusburger had expressed an interest in strengthening the teaching of Classics at the University of Bridgeport. Rather than requesting that he as a historian teach a new section of Core Studies 4, we suggested that he work with the faculty of Core Studies 1 (Classical Origins of Western Culture). Consequently, Professor Juliusburger met regularly with two sections of Core Studies 1, served as a guest lecturer, and tutored students in those sections. He spent one day per week at Bridgeport where he coordinates the required senior honors seminars and is working on constructing a required core curriculum. He conducted a series of interviews with the chairpersons of each Brooklyn College department as well as selected administrators. He also served on the Planning Committee for the summer Faculty Development Seminar, and his participation there proved invaluable.

Professor Betsy Gitter. Professor Gitter was a late addition to the program and, consequently, maintained a full teaching schedule at John Jay College. Her participation was limited to weekly attendance in the Provost's Seminar.

Professor Joanne Reitano. Professor Reitano taught a section of Core Studies 4. She also chairs the Liberal Arts and Sciences Task Force at LaGuardia Community College which met weekly throughout the semester. Professor Reitano, in preparation for a paper she gave at the Hilbert College "Conference on General Education and the Two-Year College: The Core Curriculum," utilized the agenda of the Provost's Seminar to examine the role of general education in community colleges.

Professor Sandra Vaughn. Professor Vaughn taught a section of Core Studies 3 (People, Power, and Politics). In her role as chair of the Faculty Senate, she is responsible for strengthening the support for general education among the faculty. Professor Vaughn was in regular contact with her President who gave her special assignments during the semester including one to examine ways to improve the effectiveness of developmental education programs at LeMoyne-Owen College.

In addition to activities the Associates arranged themselves, each Associate met with the Provost for a preliminary private session, on other occasions upon request, and three met for terminal interviews. Other staff of the Provost's Office were regularly available to answer questions related to the core curriculum, Brooklyn College, or administrative arrangements. This informal support was heavily utilized in the beginning of the semester as the Associates learned their way around the College, and less as the semester progressed.

The Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning

The centerpiece of the Associates-in-Residence Program was the Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning. This Seminar matched the five Associates with five Brooklyn College colleagues plus invited guests to discuss definitions and goals of general education as well as the specific institutions represented by the Associates. The Seminar met weekly throughout the semester. In anticipation of the first session, a working "syllabus" was prepared that provided a proposed structure for the sessions (see Attachment F), subject to revision at the will of the constituents. By the end of the semester, the outline had been fully covered.

The Brooklyn College participants were drawn from the Departments of Physics, Sociology, English, History, and Classics. They included a former chairperson of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In addition, the

chairperson of the original ad hoc Faculty Council Committee which developed the core curriculum proposal was invited to give a presentation at an early session and was so interested that he, with the approval of the body, participated in all the remaining sessions.

The early sessions of the Seminar were devoted to definitions and included a position paper prepared by one of the Associates which prompted a provocative response by a Brooklyn College participant. Most participants read, if they had not already, the Harvard "Red Book" and Allan Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind in preparation for discussion. Five weeks were then devoted to exploration of the issues confronting the Associates' institutions. These sessions, according to reports from the Associates, were of immense value and fed directly into the ongoing discussions at the home campuses. In fact, the Associates regularly brought back reports from their own Task Forces which led to new discussions and strategies for meeting immediate problems and for bringing about change. The final portion of the semester was devoted to explorations of teaching strategies and the role of the natural sciences in required general education. A final luncheon session served as a capstone to what had proved a remarkably energizing, occasionally heated, and insightful experience which examined issues both conceptually and on the anvil of very specific cases.

Outside Program Evaluation

As proposed in our original design, we believed that an outside evaluation would be most useful in analyzing the usefulness and success of the two new programs offered as part of the project: the Summer Associates and the Associates-in-Residence Program. To this end, we contracted with Professor Donald Cress (Philosophy) of Northern Michigan University to serve in this capacity. Professor Cress had visited Brooklyn College as a

participant in the Visitors Program during a year that he spent as an ACE Fellow. Professor Cress came to mind because of his national perspective in general education trends, the insightfulness of the questions he asked during the Visitors Program he attended, and his research interest in general education program evaluation. We believed that these qualifications made him particularly appropriate to evaluate what was, in many ways, a unique enterprise.

Agreement with Professor Cress was reached in February, and he was sent all the background information available including the full FIPSE proposal. He made a two-day visit to the campus in March at which time he met with Provost Wolfe, Bruce Hoffacker, Assistant to the Provost, and each of the Associates. He also attended the weekly session of the Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning. Professor Cress returned to Brooklyn College in June where he functioned as a participant-observer in the five-day program of the summer Faculty Development Seminar.

Professor Cress filed a report in August which can be found in full as Attachment G. The report will not be commented on here except to note its conclusion:

> Brooklyn College has achieved a national reputation as a model for general education/core studies. Brooklyn College, in virtue of its status as a faculty development success story and as a leading proponent of the Core, is ideally suited to house such a [national Center for Core Studies]. Its Associates-in-Residence and Summer Associates Programs have proved to be highly successful. They permitted colleagues from other institutions to see what many "alumni" of the Visitors Program wished they too could have seen: the core process, up close and over a protracted period. I strongly endorse the formation of (and support for) a Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The most salient conclusion of our experimental year is that the need for such a Center for Core Studies exists, and that need is pressing. While

many institutions have responded to the call for curricular reform, their Task Forces, faculty committees, or ad hoc bodies are now facing the hard task of finding consensus on the educational underpinnings of their individual approaches and translating those principles into curricula and individual courses. It is at this formative stage that the Center plays its most critical role: to recognize that each institution is sui generis and that no individual solution is appropriate for all institutions; to suggest tactics which are essential in developing a consensus (even when it appears that no agreement is possible); and to highlight the importance of planning for implementation during the formative process. Brooklyn College continues to receive requests for information on its curriculum and core process from other institutions simply on a word-of-mouth basis. The Center was never advertised, and participation was limited to past visitors. There can be little doubt that a participatory Center, properly advertised, would draw dramatically increased numbers of participants.

Recognizing the continued demand, and based on our four years of visitors programs and the one-year experimental Center, we make the following recommendations:

1. A Center for Core Studies that provides participatory programs is the most efficacious way of meeting a nationally identified need in higher education. While the dissemination of information and availability of consultant services are important parts of a fully-operational Center (and, in fact, Brooklyn College is informally providing such services, of necessity on a small scale), it is the on-site participatory programs which have the greatest impact.

2. Participants in Center programs must include colleagues from institutions searching for strategies to design and approve curricular change as well as those engaged in implementing core programs. The interaction between faculty at different stages of the process reinforces the perception that positive change is possible and increases awareness that implementation problems are endemic and their resolution critical to the core process.

3. The Center must provide a graduated set of programs allowing participants to choose the level of involvement they believe necessary to support the work being done on their campus.

4. The Center needs to be a continuing entity. We constantly have requests from visitors seeking to have other colleagues from their institution participate in the program they themselves participated in. This common phenomenon may be the product of the system of rotation which is characteristic of faculty governance, or it may be based on the need to develop "allies" as the curriculum development process proceeds. We believe that only when colleagues recognize the Center as a continuing force will they be able to derive full benefits from the programs.

5. A Center cannot exist without permanent administrative support. The experimental year relied on a Brooklyn College contribution of 25% of the time of one staff person in the Provost's office and one-half time secretary supported by the grant. While this arrangement proved barely sufficient for the project, we now recognize that a permanently established Center will require administrative support which has the Center activities as its top priority.

Brooklyn College was pleased to have had the opportunity to continue its history of service to other institutions through the experimental Center for Core Studies. We have no doubt that the need for the Center has been demonstrated and, given the necessary support, Brooklyn College would be prepared to consider the permanent establishment of such a Center on our campus. We recently submitted a two-year proposal to FIPSE as a follow-up to this highly successful one-year experiment to allow a more extensive pilot period for testing and refining the structure and programs of an on-going Center for Core Studies. We see this new proposal as a second step, prior to seeking the assistance of a sponsoring foundation or national endowment which will be required to provide the kind of stable budget base essential to sustain the scope and mission and meet the national demand envisaged to serve higher education institutions.

ATTACHMENT A

VISITORS PROGRAM
October 19 - 20, 1987

Dr. Loretta Burns
Tuskegee University

Dean William Camp
Luzerne Community College

Professor Richard Fox
Suffolk County Community College

Assistant Vice Provost Peter S. Gold
SUNY at Buffalo

Associate Provost Paul Hamill
Ithaca College

Sr. Kathleen Kelly
Mount St. Mary's College

Professor Peter Klinge
Ithaca College

Professor Eric Lindermayer
Suffolk County Community College

Dr. F.E. Lowe
Southern Connecticut University

Professor Steven Neuwirth
Western Connecticut State University

Dr. Gardner Pond
Essex Community College

Dean Mary E. Quinlivan
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Dr. Philip Smith
Southern Connecticut University

Ms. Donna Swartz
Essex Community College

Dr. Sandra C. Vaughn
LeMoyne-Owen College

Dr. Bing K. Wong
Wilkes College

VISITORS PROGRAM
November 23 - 24, 1987

Dean Paul Anderson
Massachusetts Bay Community College

Professor David Andrew
University of New Hampshire

Sr. Michele Aronica
St. Joseph's College

Miss Deborah Bates
St. Joseph's College

Professor Spencer R. Bowers
Oakton Community College

Professor Fred Breisch
University of Wisconsin-Stout

Dean Marie Callahan
Massachusetts Bay Community College

Rev. Bede Cisco, OSB
Saint Meinrad College

Dean Van Coufoudakis
Indiana University - Purdue
University - Fort Wayne

Professor Gene England
Indiana State University

Dean Neil J. Hackett
Oklahoma State University

Dr. David A. Iacono-Harris
Elizabethtown College

Associate Provost William Lopes
Chicago State University

Professor Betty K. Merrill
Wilberforce University

Dean Nelva G. Runnalls
University of Wisconsin-Stout

Professor Merle Schlabaugh
Bethel College

Professor Carol Stix
Pace University

Professor Thomas Valasek
Somerset Valley Community College

Professor J. Eldon Yung
Central Missouri State University

VISITORS PROGRAM
March 21 -22, 1988

Dean Edward A. Alpers
University of California,
Los Angeles

Vice Chancellor Eugene Arden
University of Michigan-
Dearborn

Professor Kenneth J. Collins
Methodist College

Dean Norman Council
University of Utah

Professor Martin Feldman
Howard University

Ms. Lolita Lewis
University of California
Los Angeles

Vice President David McCormick
Louisiana Board of
Trustees for State Colleges
and Universities

Dean Sally Ridgeway
Adelphi University

Professor Linda Schneider
Nassau Community College

Professor Frederick Schroeder
University of Minnesota,
Duluth

Professor Deanna Schupbach
Del Mar College

Professor Ann Shapiro
SUNY at Farmingdale

Professor Charles Verharen
Howard University

Dean G. Jennifer Wilson
University of California
Los Angeles

ATTACHMENT B

Brooklyn College
Visitors Program
October 19-20, 1987

Monday, October 19

8:30 am - 10:15 am	Introduction to the Visitors Program	Provost Ethyle R. Wolfe	The Brooklyn College Story
	The Core Process	Prof. Sherman Van Solkema	Working out a core
10:15 am - 11:15 am	Workshop I: Visitors' issues/problems	Visitors and Core Faculty	Identify main issues and problems
11:15 am - 11:30 m	Plenary session on core issues	Provost Wolfe	Report results of workshop discussions
11:30 am - 12:30 pm	Lunch	President Robert L. Hess	
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm	Core Conversation: "Why Read Thucydides?"		Attend a Humanities Institute Core Conversation
2:15 pm - 3:30 pm	Workshop II: Writing Across the Curriculum	Dr. Myra Kogan	Join a core faculty workshop
3:30 pm - 4:30 pm	Meeting with Brooklyn College Students	Peer Tutors	Participate in discussions with students concerning reaction to core studies
4:30 pm	Wine and Cheese		Relax with the core faculty

Tuesday, October 20

9:00 am - 10:00 am	Core Publications Committee Core Course Coordinators	Prof. Nancy Hager	Discuss specific core materials Discuss core course administration
0:15 am - 11:45 am	Core Samplers	Prof. Patricia Mainardi Prof. Eric Steinberg	Observe the "Sampler" method for promoting curricular integration
2:00 m - 1:30 pm	Working Lunch with Core Committee	Prof. Charlton M. Lewis	Meet members of the Faculty Council committee charged with overall core direction
1:30 pm - 2:30 pm	Concluding Session	Provost Wolfe	Final questions
2:30 pm - 3:30 pm	Individual Consultation		Focus on visitor's institution

Brooklyn College
Visitors Program
November 23 - 24, 1987

ATTACHMENT B cont.

Monday, November 23

8:45 am - 10:00 am	Introduction to the Visitors Program	Provost Ethyle R. Wolfe	The Brooklyn College Story
10:00 am - 11:00 am	Workshop I: Visitors' issues/problems	Visitors and Core Faculty	Identify main issues and problems
11:00 am - 12:00 m	Plenary session on core issues	Prof. Sherman Van Solkema	Report results of workshop discussions
	The Brooklyn Core and the Core Process		Working out a Core
12:15 pm - 2:00 pm	Lunch with the Core Faculty	President Robert L. Hess	
2:15 pm - 3:30 pm	Core Samplers	Professor Hardy Hansen Professor David Seidemann	Observe the "Sampler" method for promoting curricular integration
3:30 pm - 4:30 pm	Meeting with Brooklyn College Students		Participate in discussions with students concerning reaction to core studies
4:30 pm	Wine and Cheese		

Tuesday, November 24

9:00 am - 10:00 am	Core Course Coordinators Core Publications Committee	Professor Nancy Hager Professor Teofilo Ruiz	Discuss core course administration Discuss specific core materials
10:15 am - 11:45 am	Workshop II: Writing Across the Curriculum	Dr. Myra Kogen	Join a core faculty workshop
12:00 m - 1:30 pm	Working Lunch with Core Committee	Professor Peter Brancazio	Meet members of the Faculty Council committee charged with overall core direction
1:30 pm - 2:30 pm	Concluding Session	Provost Wolfe	Final questions
2:30 pm - 3:30 pm	Individual Consultation		Focus on visitor's institution

Brooklyn College
Visitors Program
March 21 - 22, 1988

ATTACHMENT B cont.

Monday, March 21

8:45 am - 10:00 am	Introduction to the Visitors Program	Provost Ethyle R. Wolfe	The Brooklyn College Story
10:00 am - 11:00 am	Workshop I: Visitors' issues/problems	Visitors and Core Faculty	Identify main issues and problems
11:00 am - 12:00 m	Plenary session on core issues The Brooklyn Core and the Core Process	Prof. Thomas Hartmann	Report results of workshop discussions Working out a Core
12:15 pm - 2:00 pm	Lunch with the Core Faculty	President Robert L. Hess	
2:15 pm - 3:30 pm	Core Samplers	Prof. Charlton M. Lewis Prof. John Van Sickle	Observe the "Sampler" method for promoting curricular integration
3:30 pm - 4:30 pm	Meeting with Brooklyn College Students		Participate in discussions with students concerning reaction to core studies
4:30 pm	Wine and Cheese		

Tuesday, March 22

9:00 am - 10:00 am	Core Course Coordinators Core Publications Committee	Professor Edward Harris Professor Teofilo Ruiz	Discuss core course administration Discuss specific core materials
10:15 am - 11:45 am	Workshop II: Writing Across the Curriculum	Dr. Myra Kogen	Join a core faculty workshop
12:00 m - 1:30 pm	Working Lunch with Core Committee	Professor Dee Ann Clayman	Meet members of the Faculty Council committee charged with overall core direction
1:30 pm - 2:30 pm	Concluding Session	Provost Wolfe	Final questions
2:30 pm - 3:30 pm	Individual Consultation		Focus on visitor's institution

ATTACHMENT C

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

CORE CURRICULUM PROJECT

F A C U L T Y D E V E L O P M E N T S E M I N A R

June 6 - June 10, 1988

Funded by

THE MELLON FOUNDATION and the

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Project Director:

Professor Ethyle R. Wolfe

Planning Committee:

Professors:
Naomi Bushman
Charlton M. Lewis
Emily Michael
David Seidemann
Sherman Van Solkema, chair
Ethyle R. Wolfe

Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum:

	1987-88	1988-89
Professors:	David Arnow	Carolyn J. Burdick
	Sidney Aronson	Philip Gallagher
	Dee Ann Clayman	Marie Giuriceo
	Emily Michael	Emily Michael
	George S. Shapiro, chair	George S. Shapiro, chair

Core Course Coordinators:

	1987-88	1988-89
Professors:		
C.S. 1	Edward Harris	Frederick Winter
2.1	Patricia Mainardi	Patricia Mainardi
2.2	Nancy Hager	Carol Oja
3	George Vickers	Samuel Farber
4	Nicholas Papayanis	Nicholas Papayanis
5	Frederick Gardiner (Math)	Noemi Halpern (Math)
	Gerald Weiss (CIS)	Gerald Weiss (CIS)
6	Neil Schaeffer	Neil Schaeffer
7	Peter Brancazio	Peter Brancazio
8	Charlene Forest	David Seidemann
9	Bonnie Gustav	Virginia Sanchez-Korrol
10	Nanette Funk	Nanette Funk

Workshop Leaders

David Arnow	Margarite Fernandez-Olmos	James Levine
William Beer	George Fried	Charlton M. Lewis
Albert Bond	Vincent Fuccillo	Emily Michael
Naomi Bushman	Philip Gallagher	Robert Muccigrosso
Nehru E. Cherukupalli	Timothy Gura	Mary Oestereicher
Wendy Fairey	Nancy Hager	David Seidemann
	Noemi Halpern	Donez Xiques

VISITORS' INTRODUCTORY DAY

10:00-10:45 Plenary: Opening Remarks: Ethyle R. Wolfe, Project Director

Morning Session Topic: CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE

10:45-11:15 Plenary: Short presentations by four chairpersons of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum (1980-89)

Sherman Van Solkema (80-81)
Ethyle R. Wolfe (81-82)
Charlton M. Lewis (83-85)
George S. Shapiro (87-89)

11:15-12:30 Workshops: Members meet to discuss what needs to be done (and by whom) to create, implement, and maintain a Core Curriculum.

Task: To identify the most critical factors for success in developing and implementing a Core Curriculum.

Product: A written statement of the "most critical factors."

* * * *

12:30-1:30 Lunch

1:45-2:30 Plenary: Reports and discussion based on morning workshops.

Coffee Break

Afternoon Session Topic: THE NATURE OF A CORE COURSE
Chair, Emily Michael

2:30-4:00 Plenary: Members of seminar Planning Committee sketch the "Five Principles" (see Introduction to the Core Curriculum, p. 5) and instructional modes (discipline-based, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, integrated modular, etc.) adopted for Brooklyn College core courses.

General discussion of alternatives and issues--rhetoric and reality.

Brooklyn College
Faculty Development Seminar

FIRST DAY (Morning)

June 7, 1988

9:00-10:15 Plenary: "Core Curriculum Crossroads: 1988-89"
Ethyle R. Wolfe, Provost

Orientation to Tasks and Events:
Sherman Van Solkema,
Chair of the Planning Committee

* * * *

Morning Session Topic: THE CORE SEEN THROUGH STUDENTS' EYES
Chair, Wendy Fairey, Dean of the CLAS

10:30-12:00 Plenary: Panel Discussion: Peer Tutors
and Mary Oestereicher, Associate Dean, CLAS

Sharon Eisner	Core Studies 1
Rifka Wein	Core Studies 1
Jane Farb	Core Studies 3
Simone Wolfe	Core Studies 3
Christine Farrell	Core Studies 4
Pasqualino Russo	Core Studies 4
Jeffrey Kirsh	Core Studies 5
Michael McGuire	Core Studies 5

General Discussion

12:00-1:00 Lunch

FIRST DAY (Afternoon)
June 7, 1988

Afternoon Session Topic: UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH COMPARISON OF CULTURES: THE INTEGRATION OF CORE 9
Chair, Charlton M. Lewis

"Very large majorities of students perceived most Core courses as coherent and well integrated. [There were] two important exceptions to this general finding: Core Studies 9 and 5" (Raskin and Owen, p. 25).

"A general summary of the negative comments was expressed succinctly by one student: 'Core 9 was a nice idea which doesn't work.' There are several reasons, according to the students, why it doesn't work. First, covering three different countries makes the course so segmented and crammed with material that assimilation becomes very difficult.... Second, there frequently is marked unevenness in the quality of instruction among the three members of the teaching teams.... Third, team members do not successfully integrate their individual units of the course" (Raskin and Owen, p. 38).

"Three-fourths of the students in our combined samples feel that their understanding and respect for people with backgrounds different from their own had increased since entering college.... Among the Core courses, Core Studies 3 and 9 were singled out by students as being closely connected with this change..." (Raskin and Owen, p. 50).

1:00-2:15	Plenary:	Introduction to the problem. Two SAMPLERS to illustrate a thematic way to integrate Core 9 modules. 1. "Migration from Village to City: Africa" Marie Buncombe (English) 2. "Introducing India: Bengal--Rural and Urban, East and West." Leonard Gordon (History).
2:15-2:45	Plenary:	Questions and discussion of the problem. Charlton M. Lewis, Marie Buncombe, Leonard Gordon, Antonio Nadal.
2:45-3:45	Workshops:	Members meet to discuss the focusing and integration of Core 9.
	Task:	To examine what should be common to all modules of a Core 9 section to help students understand Asian, African, and Latin American cultures.
	Product:	Several written suggestions on how best to give students a coherent experience in Core 9.
3:45-4:45	Plenary:	Workshop reports and evaluation by members of the Core 9 faculty.
4:45		Wine and Cheese

SECOND DAY (Morning)
June 8, 1988

Topic: WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH SCIENCE
Chair, David Seidemann

"The serious pedagogical and administrative problems raised by the seven-week module courses are acknowledged by practically all members of the teaching faculty as well as being reflected in students' comments....Perhaps science courses in the Core Curriculum might more effectively serve their goals by focussing on contemporary issues in which scientific knowledge and ways of thought are entailed" (Raskin and Owen, p. 176).

CURRENT AND ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

9:00-9:30	Plenary:	Non-scientists' views of Core 7 and 8: Professors Bruce MacIntyre (Music) Manuel Martinez-Pons (Education) Nicholas Papayanis (History) Elisabeth Weis (Film)
9:30-10:00		Students' views of Core 7 and 8: Jeffrey Domfort Christine Farrell Michael Mcquire Heena Sultan
10:00-11:00	Plenary:	Presentation: "The Columbia U" model: "The Theory and Practice of Science" Roger Blumberg, Columbia University
11:00-11:15	Coffee Break	
11:15-12:15	Plenary:	Presentation: "The 'Thematic' Model" Brian Schwartz, Physics
12:30-1:30	Lunch	

SECOND DAY (Afternoon)
June 8, 1988

WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH SCIENCE (cont.)

1:30-3:00 **Workshops:** Members meet to consider alternative approaches to teaching science in a general education curriculum.

Task:

1. To evaluate the relative effectiveness of different teaching models as described today and as seen in the Core 7 and 8 sessions that members attended during the semester.

2. To consider incorporating different teaching models into the current science program.

3. To consider any changes that would help to foster an understanding of science. Among the possible changes are:

   -elimination of laboratories
   -changes in Tier restrictions
   -structural changes that promote better integration among the different science modules.

Product: A group statement (choose one or more of the following):

1. Identifying the strengths and weaknesses of alternative teaching models.

2. Naming and evaluating one or more ways to incorporate different teaching models into the program--e.g., offering students a choice among 2 or 3 alternative models in each course.

3. Suggesting and justifying changes in the structure of the science courses.

3:10-4:30 **Plenary:** Workshop reports and general discussion

4:30 Wine and Cheese

THIRD DAY (morning)
June 9, 1988

Morning Session Topic: WRITING AS ONE WAY TO UNDERSTANDING
Chair, Naomi Bushman

"Core Studies 1,3, and 6 were the ones which they considered most effective in improving writing ability. Substantial majorities of students reported that the writing assignments in Core Studies 2.1, 2.2, 5, and all four second-tier Core science courses had not improved their ability to write" (Raskin and Owen, p. 162).

9:00-10:15 Plenary: Writing Across the Core

Two SAMPLERS
Core 10, "Writing and Thinking Skills"
Emily Michael, Philosophy

Core 5, "Other Ways to Understanding"
Gerson Levin, Mathematics

10:15-11:30 Workshop: Members meet to discuss a particular Core course, the role of writing in that course, and the other means for achieving the goals of the course. (Groups will be assigned Core Studies 2.1, 2.2, 5, 7 & 8, or 9.)

Task: To define and identify specifically the skills you think are appropriate for this course: What new things should a student be able to do as a result of this course? To examine how and whether students' writing is necessary to the goals of the course. To look at other experiences and assignments that also serve the goals.

Product: For the course under discussion:
A statement identifying the skills and the role of writing (is it a means? an end?). What other ways can the goals be achieved? Include three classroom techniques and types of assignments.

11:45 Lunch: Workshop Reports

THIRD DAY (afternoon)
June 9, 1988

Afternoon Session Topic: A LIBERAL ARTS CORE AS STARTING POINT OR TERMINUS
Chair, Sherman Van Solkema

"The faculty have not chosen the common experience core because they think all students are (or should be) alike. Our position is exactly the opposite: the core is a starting point. The choice of this type of core is based on our deep belief in the power of common intellectual experience as a starting point for a distinctive college education" (Introduction to the Core Curriculum, p.5).

"Only a small minority of students had taken or intended to take a more advanced course in the same field as a Core course, except for Core Studies 3 and 5" (Raskin and Owen, p. 161).

1:00-2:00 Plenary: SAMPLER: Core 1, "Antigone"
Ethyle R. Wolfe, Classics

General discussion of whether not taking a post-Core elective should be taken as an indication that the Core is not serving as "a starting point and the relevance of this issue to the validity of our "belief in the power of common intellectual experience as a starting point for a distinctive college education."

2:00-3:00 Workshops: Members meet to discuss whether and how the Core can or should serve as a starting point for a liberal arts program. Some suggested barriers are:

-high credit major programs (primarily professional)
-free electives are not viewed as opening-up opportunities
-free electives are used to take introductory courses in many fields with no in-depth work done in any area other than the major
-core is stretched out over three or four years

Among the possible solutions to these barriers are:

-capping of major credits
-some required structure for free electives
-requiring a senior seminar

Task: To determine if there are significant barriers that limit the core as a starting point for life-long learning.

Product: Three changes that would enhance the Core's ability to meet its goal of serving as a starting point for a distinctive liberal arts education and life-long learning.

3:00-3:30 Plenary: Reports of workshop recorders and general discussion

3:30-4:30 Open Forum: Chair, Ethyle R. Wolfe, with current and incoming members of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum.

4:30 Final Reception

VISITORS' CLOSING DAY

Morning Session Topic: HOW DO YOU KNOW IF YOU'RE BEING SUCCESSFUL?

9:00-10:15	Plenary:	"Core Curriculum Assessment;" Tape of presentation by Robert L. Hess, President of Brooklyn College, to the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges, January, 1988.
10:30-11:30	Workshops:	Members meet to discuss assessment models.
	Task:	To consider what can and should be measured, and by what means.
	Product:	A written statement on means of measuring success in the year-to-year functioning of a core curriculum.
11:30-12:00	Plenary:	Reports and Discussion
12:00-1:00	Lunch	
1:15-2:30		Closing Forum

Brooklyn College Faculty Participants in the 1988 Seminar

AFRICANA STUDIES:	Cuthbert J. Thomas	
ART:	Lionel Bier	
BIOLOGY:	George H. Fried Ray Gavin Marion Himes	Norman L. Levin Stanley Salthe
CHEMISTRY:	Vojtech Fried Gary Mennitt	George Moriber Evan Williams
CLASSICS:	Ethyle R. Wolfe	Peter Zaneteas
COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE:	David Arnow Michael P. Barnett	Naomi Bushman
ECONOMICS:	Robert Cherry	Hyman Sardy
EDUCATION:	Manuel Martinez-Pons	Jerome Megna
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES:	Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio Mary Oestereicher	David Walters
ENGLISH:	Louis Asekoff Martin Elsky Wendy Fairey	Tucker Farley Jules Gelernt Donez Xiques
FILM:	Elisabeth Weis	
GEOLOGY:	Nehru E. Cherukupalli David Leveson	David Seidemann
HEALTH SCIENCE:	Leslie Jacobson	
HISTORY:	Philip Gallagher Christoph M. Kimmich Ruth Kleinman	Charlton M. Lewis Robert Muccigrosso Nicholas Papayanis
MATHEMATICS:	Raymond Gittings Charles Godino	Noemi Halpern
MODERN LANGUAGES & LITERATURES:	Margarite Fernandez-Olmos	Thomas Mermall
MUSIC:	Nancy Hager Bruce C. MacIntyre	Sherman Van Solkema
PHILOSOPHY:	Edward Kent	Emily Michael
PHYSICAL EDUCATION:	Phyllis Bigel	
PHYSICS:	Albert Bond Norma Eisen	Victor Franco

POLITICAL SCIENCE:	Vincent Puccillo Michael Kahan	James Levine
PUERTO RICAN STUDIES:	Antonio Nadal	
SOCIOLOGY:	William Beer Mark Fishman	Marvin Koenigsberg
SPEECH:	Timothy Gura	
STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES:	Patricia Trant	

Summer Associates

Rev. Thomas E. Chambers, C.S.C.
Our Lady of Holy Cross College

Professor Anthony Colaianne
Virginia Tech

Professor Donald A. Cress
Northern Illinois University

Professor William Darden
Marymount College

Professor Richard Fox
Suffolk Community College

Professor Robert J. Frankle
Memphis State University

Dr. A. Patricia J. Hennessey
Merrimack College

Professor Howard Horowitz
Ramapo College

Professor Manuel Schonhorn
Southern Illinois University

Professor Bettie M. Smolansky
Moravian College

Professor Bruce R. Stam
Chemeketa Community College

Professor Jo Taylor
Wayne State College

From the Peer Tutoring Program

Jeffrey Domfort
Sharon Eisner
Jane Farb
Christine Farrell
Jeffrey Kirsch
Michael McGuire
Pasqualino Russo
Heena Sultan
Rifka Wein
Simone Wolfe

ATTACHMENT D

A RECORD OF

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DECISIONS

OF THE BROOKLYN COLLEGE

CORE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

FUNDED BY THE MELLON FOUNDATION

AND THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

JUNE 6 - JUNE 10, 1988

FOREWARD: "CORE CURRICULUM CROSSREADS--1988-89"

The special character of the 1988 Brooklyn College Seminar for Faculty Development emerged at the outset in the opening-day address by Ethyle R. Wolfe. Her address was entitled "Core Curriculum Crossroads--1988-89." Speaking both as Project Director of the summer seminar and as soon-to-retire chief academic officer and Provost, Dr. Wolfe outlined what she sees as the task before the college in 1988-89 vis a vis the core curriculum: To act upon the issues that now so clearly present themselves. We have accumulated seven years of student, faculty, and administrative experience with the core curriculum. Information is now available from an outside assessment study--the "Raskin Report" -- completed in Spring 1988 (though much of its material is already somewhat outdated). Both our experience and the outside study point to the coming year as a time for action. It is a year for reconceptualization. It is a year for choosing alternatives and decisively making the changes--large or small--that will produce an improved, even more effective "2nd edition" of the core at Brooklyn College.

Three large topics occupied the spotlight at the 1988 seminar: the year-long science sequence (Core Studies 7 and 8); Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American cultures (Core Studies 9); and the issue across-the-core of "writing as a way of understanding" together with "alternative ways of understanding." The closing session re-focused discussion on general education's overall thrust: "The Core as Starting Point or Terminus." In addition to speakers who described their reactions to our own Core Studies 7 and 8, two guest speakers were invited to describe alternative models of general education courses in science: Roger Blumberg of Columbia University spoke of Columbia's sequence "The Theory and Practice of Science," and Brian Schwartz of the Department of Physics presented "A 'Thematic' Model." The many points of view, contrary findings, alternatives, and on some issues strong consensus and general conclusions--all recorded on the spot as the running accounts of individual workshop and plenary sessions--make up the bulk of the present volume. A listing of "Highlights and Conclusions" based on presentations and the running reports follows below.

At this Seventh Annual summer seminar, sixty Brooklyn College faculty participants were joined by ten hard-headed Core Curriculum students drawn from the Peer Tutoring program, which is directed by Associate Dean Mary Oestereicher. The invitation to these students to participate throughout the seminar was inspired by the strong contribution of other peer tutors to a single session last year. Again this year, the students' incisive articulation of problems, of strengths and weaknesses, their frequent admonitions--in effect--not to throw the

baby out with the bath, and their uninhibited expression of the plain facts of student experience were admired and appreciated throughout the conference.

In addition, for the first time at a Brooklyn College Faculty Development Seminar, visitors from twelve other institutions participated through the week. These colleagues came from colleges and universities located from New England to Virginia and Illinois, each in varying stages of core curriculum design or implementation. Almost all of the visitors had become acquainted with Brooklyn's Core Curriculum through one or another of the two-day Visitors' Programs held during the last few years. As expected, the insights, reactions, and challenges of these colleagues from other institutions proved to be thoroughly stimulating for the Brooklyn faculty. What the visitors took home is suggested by such phrases from their letters as "electrifying week" and "substantial intellectual discussion on curricular topics such as I had never encountered before." The post-seminar critiques received from visitors have been included as Appendix A.

HIGHLIGHTS AND CONCLUSIONS

(1) A "flexible" Tier 2--that is, a Tier 2 in which each course is given in two or three "versions"--seems most promising for the future. For all or most of the required courses of Tier 2, two or three different ways of fulfilling the requirement might be available. The different ways would retain, and be designed to fulfill, the common function of the course.

(2) On the other hand, the largely "fixed" aspect of Tier 1 is increasingly recognized as a most productive and essential element of the Brooklyn Core.

(3) Many faculty believe that the original Core Studies 7 and 8 might well be retained in its original format (with certain problems solved), but only as one option. As one way of fulfilling the science-year requirement, for example, a sizable number of sections of Core Studies 7 and 8 would run, but alternatives to Core Studies 7 and 8 (perhaps at first in smaller numbers) would also be available (see below).

(4) If retained at all, Core Studies 7 and 8 should be brought in line with the original concept of the course. Clearly, the integration of the four modules must become much more explicit--perhaps drawing on the explanatory power of some such framework as the "Powers of Ten" approach, one of those outlined by Professor Brian Schwartz. Though specialists are working at parts of the picture, the four modules must not be allowed to disintegrate into isolated bits and pieces, each fending for itself. These were not intended to be four separate courses. The segments should be coordinated and taught by the fair number of faculty who aver that the "integrated modular" approach has sometimes worked well, and still could work well, at Brooklyn College. (A number of such faculty were observed in their classrooms by the seminar members late in Spring semester.) If, however, the separation of segments of the course into four isolated parts cannot be overcome by such an integrating framework, the consensus would be for reconceptualizing the science year and starting anew.

(5) Two or three alternative ways of fulfilling the science-year requirements ("common function, different approach") should be developed. Although it is obvious that the integrated math and science approach with primary source material ("Theory and Practice of Science") described by Roger Blumberg would not serve across the board either at Columbia or at Brooklyn--that is, not for twelve or fifteen sections--a small number of sections developing this model might make a significant alternative for some students. Other promising thematic and topical ways of shaping a science year were suggesting by Brian Schwartz. The science faculty should now be asked to consider alternatives and to select, for wider consideration, those that would continue to promote the common purpose of the science year.

(6) Some of the laboratory work in science came in for hard criticism. The consensus was that in some, but certainly not all, areas

labs should be eliminated on educational grounds as unjustified and counter-productive. Time could be better spent in other ways.

(7) The practice--in some areas and some sections--of having graduate students with insufficient command of the English language in charge of labs (for all the cogency of "explanations" and "defense" of the practice) is insupportable and must be dealt with.

(8) The exclusive use of multiple-choice examinations was strongly and repeatedly criticized by students and many of the faculty. It was argued that the exams placed a premium on memorizing facts and discouraged active involvement with the subject material.

(9) With respect to Core Studies 9, it was stated as the opinion of the planning committee and the chairperson of the session that the many current problems that are fundamentally administrative in nature should not be up for discussion (though bits and pieces surfaced), with the understanding that a new core coordinator and a renewed administrative commitment to this crucially important course are in the offing.

(10) The decidedly predominant opinion was for changing from three to two areas in Core Studies 9. More effective staffing, greater depth because of lesser coverage, and the realization of one-third smaller class size were the three factors considered. These factors were thought to greatly outweigh the loss of a third area for each student, while retaining the essential team-teaching and "comparison of cultures" features.

(11) With respect to concerns expressed about the diminution of effectiveness of the core coordinators, it is clear that the critical role of the coordinators needs renewed emphasis. Their responsibilities need to be clarified and their work needs support, both from the college administration and the Core Committee. It was announced at the final session by Professor Shapiro that this topic is already on the agenda for next year's Core Curriculum Committee. New coordinators need to be briefed. Their day-to-day, week-to-week responsibilities for all aspects of the health of their courses--both through one-to-one and group faculty meetings--seems to be not nearly as effectively carried out as they have been and should be. The connection of the network of coordinators to the work of the Core Committee needs to be revitalized each year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Forward: "Core Curriculum Crossroads" 1

Highlights and Conclusions iii

Table of Contents

Core Curriculum Crossroads -- 1988-89
Ethyle R. Wolfe. 1

Program 15

Critical Issues in Developing a Core
Sherman Van Solkema. 27
Ethyle R. Wolfe. 29
Charlton M. Lewis. 32
George S. Shapiro. 34

Visitors First Day Workshop Assignments 37
Visitors First Day Workshop Reports 38
Faculty Development Seminar Workshop Assignments. 42

Plenary and Workshop Reports

First Day: Understanding the World through Comparison of Cultures: the Integration of Core 9

Introduction to Core 9 Session. 50
Charlton M. Lewis
Plenary 53
Workshop Reports. 54
Plenary 64

Second Day: Ways of Understanding the World through Science

Nicholas Papayanis 65
Bruce MacIntyre. 68
Manuel Martinez-Pons 70
Plenary 72
Workshops 73
Plenary 83

Third Day (A.M.): Writing as one way to Understanding
Workshop Reports 84

Third Day (P.M.): A Liberal Arts Core as Starting Point or Terminus
Workshop Reports 94

Plenary. 105

A Closing Note of Thanks to Ethyle R. Wolfe 106

Appendix: Reports from Visiting Seminar Associates

Core Curriculum Cossroads 1988-89

Ethyle R. Wolfe

Welcome to the seventh summer of the Brooklyn College Core Faculty Development Seminars. Since those of you who have not attended a previous seminar may not be aware, let me note that the number of participants at this seminar has been expanded from the customary maximum of sixty to eighty-five. Some of us, the members of the Planning Committee and twelve colleagues from other institutions selected from alumni of our four years of Visitors Programs, are in our second day of a five-day seminar of which the next three days are dedicated to Brooklyn College Core and faculty development issues. In attendance are sixty-three Brooklyn College faculty from core teaching and non-core teaching departments, twelve Summer Associates including the evaluator of the 1987-88 FIPSE-funded Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College, and ten of our fellow laborers in the core vineyard who represent our valued and respected cadre of students, the core peer tutors. Incidentally among our faculty participants, for the first time in the history of the seminars, every member of our Academic Administration, the Provost, Associate Provost, Undergraduate Dean and two Associate Deans, and even the Dean of our Graduate School applied and were admitted to participate by the Planning Committee.

My customary role at these seminars is to participate both as a member of the core faculty and as Project Director for the grant that funds them (NEH and then Mellon). The first Summer Seminar was launched in 1982 after the inception of the core when only the first tier of five courses had been implemented under the direction of the first elected Standing Committee on the Core Curriculum of which I in my preprovostial incarnation was elected to be faculty Chairperson. Ever since then, in my capacity as Project Director I have been assigned the function of opening the program, with a State-of-the-Core Report. These reports have appeared in the annual proceedings of the seminars, and I would remind you that your contributions during the next three days will find their immortal place in this year's proceedings.

Veterans of previous seminars will notice on the program that my remarks for the Summer 1988 Seminar have been given a new and perhaps ominous sounding title - "Core Curriculum Crossroads 1988-89" to be delivered wearing the Provost's hat only for this moment. This title was chosen by consensus of this year's Planning Committee (of which I am a charter member as Project Director of both the expiring Mellon grant and of a 1987-88 FIPSE-funded Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College). This change of title is due to more than the proverbial seven-year itch or the Planning Committee's fear that we may be entering the biblical cycle of seven lean years. As Chief Academic Officer of the College no one can better testify than I that, all the external accolades notwithstanding, the birth, evolution, and survival of our core curriculum during the past seven fiscally leanest years in the College's history can only be explained as a miracle of the determination and ingenuity of the Brooklyn College faculty as well as the selfless commitment of a talented and revitalized core teaching faculty and the leadership of vigilant members of the core committees (and parenthetically an administration, equally committed in spirit, if not in purse).

Let me ask your indulgence on the eve of my retirement, if I confess to you that for me during each of these seven years the core has always been at a crossroads. As I have stated in countless invited speeches across the nation, our much admired core curriculum is only a "work in progress," and the day it stops being treated that way both in concept and in implementation, I maintain that our program is at risk of going the familiar route of so many new programs into atrophy and faculty burnout. Those of us intimately involved in working on the core have never been blind to the shortfalls between our hopes and reality -- the originators of the concept, members of the core committees, the core coordinators, and especially this Chief Academic Officer. Whatever shortcomings faculty energy and ingenious strategies could not overcome can be blamed largely on lack of adequate resources. Let me repeat a simple fact that makes whatever you've accomplished even more remarkable (and I wish people would listen and believe me when I say it). This core was launched and has been sustained for seven years without diverting the constantly declining resources of this College to it and with no new faculty added to teach in it, despite the heaviest attrition through retirements in departments that are the very ones obligated to cover all the core sections. In the context of annual state line reductions in which all departments suffered (that is two hundred instructional lines over the past five years alone), new hirings at the College were made at the expense of attrition in core departments in order either to launch new majors or to sustain the heavy student demand in career-oriented departments. The cross I have had to bear as the Chief Academic Officer is that I felt conscience-bound to keep my pledge to myself to maintain some integrity for the majors (given the heavy budget cuts), and that I had to resist the clarion calls from the core faculty for smaller-sized core classes and to postpone my own desire to hire much needed full-time faculty in the gradually depleted departments where new blood was sorely needed. In fact, the staffing crisis and its implications for student success (especially as our enrollments keep increasing) became so great that at my initiation the presidential statement attending the state budget request for both 1987 and 88 included the long overdue need for addressing or redressing the funding deficits in the general education curriculum which serves every student at Brooklyn College. A request for fifteen new lines for core instruction was included, and, while the validity of our request was enthusiastically endorsed at the state budget hearings, as some of the chairpersons here now know, the Chancellor's office instead mandated delivery of a large number of instructional line reductions during these same past two years. The recent discovery of a nine hundred million budget gap in Albany does not bode so well for the future, although I superstitiously thought that the College's fiscal luck would change as soon as I departed.

And so we come to the crossroads. I have noted on many recent occasions and especially in the past two Summer Seminars that I personally felt that the time had arrived for us to take a comprehensive look at the whole core in terms of its original goals, its structure, and student success and satisfaction, acknowledging all the time the successful changes and creative improvements that have taken place in individual core courses over the years. While we have known for some time where we thought things were not working and have found consensus on what has been working for the students and for the faculty, the constantly postponed completion of the ongoing Raskin-Owen evaluation inclined many to urge that major

reconsideration await what was thought to be the imminent availability of the evaluation report. Ironically, that situation may have served as a brake on revision of the core. But nothing could stop the revision of individual core courses which has been an ongoing process responsive to faculty, student, and peer tutor judgments. Just two months ago that evaluation report was turned in, almost two years overdue, and is now in our hands. Since the evaluation report itself acknowledges the limited value of a data base drawn from the entering classes of '82, '83 and '84, and recommends follow up on the basis of later data - it does not bring us up to date with regard to the impact on students and faculty of cumulative changes that were introduced into individual core courses and especially of the impact of core-related retention efforts during the past three to four years. Nevertheless, the Planning Committee reviewed the report carefully and used it as a basis for much of the agenda of the next three days. As my letter of invitation to the seminar suggested, this Summer Seminar is intended to serve as a springboard for taking a view from the bridge, based on all the incremental evidence we can pull together, both documented and anecdotal, as well as specific findings from the Raskin-Owen report, a report, to its credit self-described as only the beginning of a recommended longer-range evaluation of the core to be based hopefully on more accessible data as the result of the College's projected establishment of an Office of Institutional Research. But the ability to understand potential options or to recommend directions the core might take at its seventh-year crossroads requires more than ever some familiarity with the evolutionary changes that have taken place since the core's inception (and been implemented for the most part after the core experience of the cadres surveyed for the evaluation). So for the purposes of this seminar, a State-of-the-Core Report as of 1988 seems especially in order.

Before I turn to my assessment of the crossroads agenda for 1988-89 and identify some particular unresolved core issues which have been raised periodically in the faculty seminars and have been most recently reincarnated in the sampling of faculty and student perceptions reported in the Raskin-Owen report, I feel obliged to bring you up to date on some of the changes that have taken place in the core since 1981. All of us intimately involved with the core curriculum have no doubt that the fulcrum and catalyst for the changes and core efforts each year have actually been the Summer Faculty Seminars. I therefore believe that capsule sketches of the focus of each year's seminar and their cumulative impact on changes in the core's substance and delivery are necessary and may even prove useful as context for understanding the agenda to which you will be contributing during the next three days. There are many positive changes that have taken place, largely unadvertised and sometimes so subtle that they were imperceptible to those not engaged in our core process, a factor which may have led to the perception as reported in the Raskin-Owen evaluation (p. 159) that, while the Summer Seminars were enthusiastically praised by all for the valuable dialogue and fruitful discussions they inspired, there was a feeling that there had been little follow-up of most of the recommendations proposed at the seminars, noting that it seemed to be difficult to put changes into effect.

Yet successive core committees and especially Faculty Council explicitly adduced imminent expectations of delivery of the evaluation as reason for turning down some of the recommended changes. But let me assure

you that the core curriculum of 1982 was not the same in 1984; and that the core of 1988 renders some of the evaluation's perceptions obsolete. History never stands still.

To save time, I will try to give a brief account of the genesis and proceedings of the annual Summer Seminars from 1982 through 1984 and add some bullets for the last three years.

By the summer of 82, as Chair of the Faculty Committee, I had already supervised the implementation of the first tier of five courses. During the 81-82 academic year, putting aside my congenital aversion to grantsmanship as immoral, I sought external funding for Summer Faculty Development Seminars because I had come to realize that, to make a common-experience core that looked good on paper work for our students, it would have to work a priori for our faculty. In an attempt to find a way to convert a gifted faculty of specialists into a coherent and integrated cadre of teachers committed to making a common and yet-to-be integrated general education program work, the first seminar was structured to bring the core faculty together to learn about each other's courses and to seek ways to interrelate them. We needed to forge a coherent program that would work for students and that would ultimately develop links to the rest of the curriculum as the target for pre-core programs and as a springboard to post-core courses and to the majors, which themselves could benefit from reexamination in light of the new core foundation. With five of the courses already taught without benefit of the kind of workshop we are engaged in and with five new courses of the second tier to be launched in the next Fall semester, we faced a formidable task. I will now quickly read summaries excerpted from the record of the proceedings of the 1985 Summer Seminar:

"The first Summer Seminar (1982) [funded by NEH] now a legendary success, set the pattern of those that followed. It was preceded by a highly productive special 4-day seminar devoted exclusively to Core Studies 9 [which is on the agenda of this seminar], from the outset considered the most difficult course to mount. During that seminar, prospective instructors formed into teams of three and developed programmatic coherence for the sections they were scheduled to teach in the fall. The first seminar devoted to the whole core [the prototype for the next six years] was comprised of 50 core faculty chosen from three times that number of applicants and representing 20 departments. Four days later, fifty starry-eyed (and bleary-eyed) colleagues emerged as zealous missionaries, or, as they styled themselves "born again" professors who had rediscovered the joys of teaching. But it was far more than a revival meeting, for they discovered a unity of purpose as they spent four days in intense and serious discourse about the students they would teach and in deep concern about how best to help them learn. In the process they got to know and respect colleagues in other disciplines, most of whom they had never met, and to know and respect the content and purpose of core courses other than their own."

With regard to the next year's (1983) seminar, I quote: "that first Summer's Seminar seemed a hard act to follow, and we could not meet the demand its success generated to attend the second year's seminar, although we were able, by offering two separate seminars in consecutive weeks, to accommodate a total of one hundred faculty. One of our happiest decisions

was to add the active participation of members of the Department of Educational Services who teach Remedial, Developmental, and ESL courses, as guests on one of the days. The panel discussion they presented on the problems of students in the classroom from listening to note-taking to discussion was a highlight of the seminar both as eye-opener and resource for pedagogical techniques. I'm sure that for many of us our teaching modes have been altered since then for the better. Since the overview on the first page of the report for the second Summer Seminar sums up rather nicely the difference between the first and second summers, let me paraphrase the summary: with one year's experience of full implementation of the two tiers behind us, the emphasis was on the practical realities of classroom teaching, of how much could be taught and what techniques could be developed and shared to make the core a vital, coherent, and successful experience for all students. As a participant in the first two summers noted, the first seminar was 'like falling in love, the second like a good marriage.'"

"In the third year, 1984, the seminar admitted 56 core faculty from 17 departments as well as members of the Department of Educational Services who participated on a special panel and in the workshops. A new departure for us was the inclusion to full participation of eight colleagues from five of CUNY's community colleges, admitted on the basis of a special appeal from the Chancellor's office. Their active participation in our core process was probably the most inspired and effective step taken in the direction of improving articulation between community and senior colleges, as we interacted so easily in sharing common concerns about students, curriculum, the teaching of conceptual thinking, and other pedagogical issues."

I now turn to excerpts from the "Brief Overview" of the 1985 Proceedings:

"The most distinctive feature of the 1985 Faculty Development Seminar was the presence of thirteen faculty from non-core departments...." in addition to serving on a special panel, "after two days it was hard to tell who were core teachers and who were not." The core faculty gained perspective from the suggestions of the non-core participants about contributions they might make to the core's further development. "Everyone seemed to feel the vigor and the joy of a full 'university' faculty working together on the single mission of enhancing the ways we educate Brooklyn College students."

The 1986 and 87 seminars under a new Mellon grant shifted the focus to dealing with courses that were thought to be problematic in some respects: in 1986, cores 5, 9, and 10. Since 5 and 9 by the end of that session still remained problematic, the Core Committee picked up the challenges begun in the Summer Seminar of that year. A meeting of Core 5 faculty was held in the Fall, and the Core committee met four times with the coordinators and chairs and brought in an outside consultant through Mellon funds. The result was that the Committee invited and in Spring 1987 selected from six proposals four experimental versions of the course authorized to be offered during the coming academic year, 1987-88, along with sections of the current model. An analogous or different procedure for Core Studies 9 followed the seminar. In addition to meetings with the Core Committee in the Spring and the Fall, the Provost convened a meeting of the large original Core 9 Coordinating Committee in the Spring and some other veteran teachers of the

course, and as a result, on June 5th of 1987 a one-day seminar with thirty Core 9 faculty present took place to review its goals and structure. A thorough airing of controversial issues (including administrative and staffing problems) set the agenda for the next academic year. During the current academic year, as follow-up to that seminar, the coordinating committee was abolished and three area heads were appointed to work with the coordinator of the course. The Provost also sent a letter to all faculty members inviting qualified faculty members to indicate interest in teaching the course. Some of Core 9's still unresolved issues are on the agenda of the present seminar.

The most notable feature of the 1987 three-day seminar was the involvement of student representatives from the Peer Tutoring Center who presented a student panel so impressive that by popular demand ten peer tutors have been invited as full-fledged participants in this 1988 seminar.

But no account of the Summer Seminars can be complete without paying tribute to the initiatives the seminars generated and the impact on the following academic year of the sparks they ignited for new core-related activities. In addition to voluntary collaborative enterprises spawned by the camaraderie of workshop association or communal lunches during these four-day and later three-day seminars of close contact, the consciousness raised with regard to the necessity of integrating the core's ten courses, an unending task, became the mother of a creative faculty's inventiveness. Examples are legion: The Core "Sampler" Series -- The Brainchild of the Core-Coordinators' Network -- (there are three samplers in this seminar), The "Core Conversation Series" converted from its original title "Core Confrontation Series" -- sponsored by the Humanities Institute. (I have suggested that the change in name from "Confrontations" to "Conversations" symbolized the new community of discourse across the disciplines created by the summer seminars.)

The experimental devices successive Core Committees designed in the search for coherence are too many to recount. The periodic Writing Workshops have become institutionalized, (and this will be the first seminar without one!) and the Writing Center's Director joined enthusiastically in and has become a fixture of the core process. The fact that the 2-tiered structure survived, despite repeated attempts to find alternate structures by successive Core Committees and despite sustained debates on its advantages and disadvantages in Summer Seminars, gives some validity to the two rationales behind the design of the original Ad Hoc Committee. Let me recall them for your information since the evaluation's references to the structure reflect innocence of the functional purposes of that design.

1. The Core's tier structure was deliberately chosen to develop progression and greater sophistication in skills from one tier to the next and to provide building blocks of information and methodologies on which tier-2 courses and advanced electives could draw, and to provide that missing common fund of reference for communication between faculty and students within and across the tiers and in the rest of the curriculum beyond the core.

2. The tier structure, like the writing-across-the-core component, provided a vertical mechanism which could contribute to the development of greater coherence among the core courses.

Since the structure did not provide for furthering the goal of horizontal integration, individual experiments were devised in pairing of first-tier courses, e.g., Core Studies 4 (History) and Core Studies 2.2 (Music) were paired with sections of Core Studies 3 (People, Power and Politics). I still think my early dream of playing musical chairs among the first tier courses is the best strategy for improving the core's coherence.

As for core-generated retention efforts, the pairing of core sections 1, 3, and 4 with English composition sections for all entering freshman has been for several years supported by grants from CUNY Central under the "Replication of Exemplary Projects" funding category. I am still uneasy about the uneven advantage taken of the pairing by faculty (some of the instructors do not coordinate their paired courses) - the only thing I'm sure of is that the smaller-sized section that has to be provided (25) has to do some good. In any case, comparison with control groups of unpaired sections showed more successful results for students in the pairing project.

A pilot faculty mentoring project was planned for Fall 1985 as a partial response to the most common recommendation issuing from every group of seminar participants calling for core counseling. Sixty core faculty volunteers were selected to serve as mentors for a cadre of 300 entering freshman who would be taking core courses by virtue of having passed all the CUNY skills assessment tests, but as a target group had profiles and high school averages which in previous years had signified potential victims of attrition. As a volunteer mentor, I can testify to the importance of the mentoring program for student retention. The workshops of the mentoring project led to a long overdue delivery of an early warning system and other support mechanisms as well as to productive symbiosis of the mentors with the traditional freshman registration counselors. This year, two years later, every entering freshman had a mentor with the number of faculty volunteers now increased from 60 to 225. On June 1, the Provost's office submitted a grant proposal to CUNY Central for a pilot project to add student peer mentors who would join the faculty mentors, not only because of the anticipated increase in new students, but to assure that entering students take advantage of the service. This pilot is part of a new Comprehensive Counseling Proposal prepared by Dean Wendy Fairey. Its roots derive from the core-generated mentoring initiative, on which the peer tutoring project was grafted.

My early observation that more important than the core itself is the impact it has had on so many other areas of the College has been confirmed time and time again. Or, to put my point another way, new core-related activities tend to beget spinoffs and beneficial by-products. For example, during the first semester of the mentoring project, I was so frustrated with the lack of a resource for my mentees who needed a timely academic intervention system to cope with problems in particular courses that, within a very brief gestation period, a peer-tutoring system was conceived. It was brought to birth shortly after the beginning of the Spring 1986 semester and implemented with 14 tutors selected by instructors of Core Studies 1, 3, and 4 from students who had previously completed the course in question under

their instruction. It is now two years old, and Associate Dean Mary Oestereicher, who shaped and directs the project, is to be commended for the efficient implementation of what began as an 11th hour project. Thanks are owed also to Professor Lionel Forestall of the Department of Educational Services who generously provided from some of his funds for four or five peer tutors for sections of Core Studies 5. It this year expanded to 30 tutors and has become a first-class operation, as you will soon learn.

A new core-related project directed at reducing attrition was inaugurated two summers ago. From its inception the core has had an impact on Pre-Core Developmental and Remedial Programs, since for the first time we had available in the first-tier courses an identifiable and manageable target at which to aim student preparation for the mainstream. A new initiative funded by a CUNY grant permitted us to offer a Pre-Freshman Summer Immersion Program for 100 entering freshman who had failed the CUNY reading and writing tests. It was an integrated, intensive, non-credit, tuition-free program, using materials from Tier 1 courses appropriate to its coordinating theme, "The City," with concentration on writing and reading workshops as well as orientation to other College survival skills. This summer's institute will be the third year of the program.

I might mention, as a very important part of the development of our core faculty and indeed of the curriculum itself, the four years of our unadvertised Visitors Programs conceived out of my inability to handle the traffic of requests for information about our core or for invitations to go to other campuses. About 200 visitors have been here to date and what began as an altruistic enterprise has turned out to be a vital agent in our own curriculum and faculty development process. The payoff has been that we have reaped the unexpected benefit of new perspectives from disinterested observers as we have shared with them our outstanding problems and sought to help them find solutions to conceived obstacles in the way of introducing or implementing core programs on their campuses. In everyone of those three programs a year, we were urged by visitors to establish a network or center for curriculum development, and many asked to participate in our Summer Faculty Development Seminars. This year-through a FIPSE grant-some of those exhortations were realized when we agreed to experiment with a one-year Center for Core Studies on this campus. And it has been quite a year! As part of the program there was a weekly Provost's Seminar on the Renewal of Liberal Learning in which colleagues from five institutions drawn from our previous Visitors Programs were joined by members of our faculty and spent the semester on campus (in most cases also teaching one core course) and participated in all our core activities. As another component of that grant, twelve institutions that had participated in one of our Visitors Programs are here today as Summer Associates, including an alumnus of this Spring's Provost's Seminar. I and other members of our faculty continue to serve as consultants on other campuses, and we continue to receive progress reports from other institutions. There is no doubt in my mind that interinstitutional dialogue is a valuable and revitalizing antidote to frustration, inbreeding, burnout, and of priceless mutual benefit to those of us in higher education.

I alluded passim to relevant Raskin-Owen comments, but let me take a few moments to report on what I consider the most meaningful accomplishments of the core program (far beyond the dreams of and not even contemplated by

the original core committee) and on some of the shortfalls, which is what many of the core faculty must be tired of hearing from me. Let me begin with some testimony from the sampled perceptions of the evaluation report (recognizing as the worst case that its validity is conditioned by the data being limited to the period when our core was a mere fledgling and the courses had not had enough time to try their wings). Nevertheless there are great concurrences especially on the less positive side between what many of us had perceived from accumulated student testimony and the evaluation report. So here are some student assessments from the report:

1. Core courses are well taught. (That is a compliment coming from students and a testimony to the new attention to pedagogy on this campus that the core generated.) It had never happened in my previous three decades at the college.

2. The individual core courses are coherent -- the alleged exceptions, it should be noted, are not surprisingly those courses that were designed to be interdisciplinary, that is the modular and the team-taught ones.

3. On page 41 a large majority find the core courses "unexpectedly interesting, enjoyable, and valuable." (only 20% disagreed.)

4. To the question "students should not be required to take a set of core courses, they should study only what interests them" -- 51% disagreed with that statement whereas one would have expected that setting the statement in the negative might prejudice the answer. What I would have expected would be that a majority even in the abstract would support the concept of free choice.

5. As for the size of the core, when asked whether they would like to have some options in the core, we should not be surprised that the majority of the sample said yes. But they would not reduce the number of courses from ten. When asked what they would add, once again it is not surprising that the fields with the largest number of majors at the College were those suggested (Economics and Psychology), both of which areas were originally proposed by the core's creators and in the evaluation were the only two cited by the faculty. Lest you think that I am only pulling the positive from the report, it is the shortfalls that the faculty have long been concerned with that were also cited by the Raskin-Owen report that are the very issues the Planning Committee chose to bring out in the open and base our work on for the next three days.

Also, with regard to a suggestion that surfaces in the report, let me cite an example of a procedural action proposed by more than one Core Committee with regard to issues and problems which had been inherited but not resolved over a number of years that was recently approved by the Faculty Council. I am referring to a retroactive pass-fail option of two courses. The evaluation's recommendation with regard to exemption exams in core courses has long been an operative principle and needs no policy action.

It should be noted that on page 171 of the evaluation report there is explicit acknowledgement that most of the key issues of the report are not new and have been under discussion. Cases in point are the sections on the

the original core committee) and on some of the shortfalls, which is what many of the core faculty must be tired of hearing from me. Let me begin with some testimony from the sampled perceptions of the evaluation report (recognizing as the worst case that its validity is conditioned by the data being limited to the period when our core was a mere fledgling and the courses had not had enough time to try their wings). Nevertheless there are great concurrences especially on the less positive side between what many of us had perceived from accumulated student testimony and the evaluation report. So here are some student assessments from the report:

1. Core courses are well taught. (That is a compliment coming from students and a testimony to the new attention to pedagogy on this campus that the core generated.) It had never happened in my previous three decades at the college.

2. The individual core courses are coherent -- the alleged exceptions, it should be noted, are not surprisingly those courses that were designed to be interdisciplinary, that is the modular and the team-taught ones.

3. On page 41 a large majority find the core courses "unexpectedly interesting, enjoyable, and valuable." (only 20% disagreed.)

4. To the question "students should not be required to take a set of core courses, they should study only what interests them" -- 51% disagreed with that statement whereas one would have expected that setting the statement in the negative might prejudice the answer. What I would have expected would be that a majority even in the abstract would support the concept of free choice.

5. As for the size of the core, when asked whether they would like to have some options in the core, we should not be surprised that the majority of the sample said yes. But they would not reduce the number of courses from ten. When asked what they would add, once again it is not surprising that the fields with the largest number of majors at the College were those suggested (Economics and Psychology), both of which areas were originally proposed by the core's creators and in the evaluation were the only two cited by the faculty. Lest you think that I am only pulling the positive from the report, it is the shortfalls that the faculty have long been concerned with that were also cited by the Raskin-Owen report that are the very issues the Planning Committee chose to bring out in the open and base our work on for the next three days.

Also, with regard to a suggestion that surfaces in the report, let me cite an example of a procedural action proposed by more than one Core Committee with regard to issues and problems which had been inherited but not resolved over a number of years that was recently approved by the Faculty Council. I am referring to a retroactive pass-fail option of two courses. The evaluation's recommendation with regard to exemption exams in core courses has long been an operative principle and needs no policy action.

It should be noted that on page 171 of the evaluation report there is explicit acknowledgement that most of the key issues of the report are not new and have been under discussion. Cases in point are the sections on the

Core 7 and 8 Science Courses, Core Studies 9 (Other Cultures), and 5 (Computer/Math course). All three have not only been the object and focus of critical review by faculty across the core at previous Summer Seminars, but have had special and continuing workshops devoted to them during the four academic years beyond the compass of the evaluators' data.

In the absence of the incumbent Chairperson's customary report in this morning's program (George Shapiro did report at yesterday's special session for our Summer Associates), let me state that the present Core Committee's year-long focus on the science courses is part of a continuum. In fact, a couple of years ago a special workshop during the academic year to consider elimination or support of the lab component by non-science core faculty led the Planning Committee to dedicate one full day of the next Summer Seminar to consideration of the structure and pedagogy of the science courses, which incidentally also preoccupied the Raskin-Owen evaluation and will be on tomorrow's agenda. It should be noted that "science literacy" is a national concern, as I know from my current membership on the American Association for the Advancement of science's panel preparing a manifesto on the role of science in general education.

It should also be noted that Raskin-Owen in their concluding remarks state explicitly "and the question of whether the trends we have discovered apply to cohorts who entered the College after 1984 can only be answered by continuing follow-up studies." As evidence that the core committees, coordinators, faculty, and the planning committee have not been Rip Van Winkle's for the past four years, the agenda for this seminar, in order to fulfill the objectives of the Mellon grant under which it is funded, are concentrated on problem courses in search of solutions, namely, Core Studies 7 and 8, 9, and 5. Fortuitously, this puts us in synch with the evaluation which, even though it's based on the 1982-84 data, cautions that modifications should be incremental and suggests beginning with the science courses.

Since Core Studies 5, after long and periodic preoccupation by the faculty in previous Summer Seminars and a full year of grant-funded faculty workshops, had this past year been authorized by the Core Committee to conduct four new experimental approaches. The Planning Committee thought it would be premature in the absence of more cumulative evidence for comparative assessment to seek a recommendation from this year's seminar. In similar vein, the long-held consensus that Core Studies 2.1, always under criticism from the day of its birth, would benefit from a more non-traditional approach and creative resturcturing into more than a truncated introductory Art History course, does not fare too well in the Raskin-Owen report. However, because this year the Core Committee had already initiated discussion with the new leadership of the Art department which has concurrently placed the 2.1 course on the anvil for its own attention and serious planning for creating a course from scratch is underway, it was judged by the Planning Committee as a not yet ripe item for this seminar. However, the issues (largely administrative and ideological) surrounding Core Studies 9 -- the most ambitious and exciting venture (as we thought) of the core's original creators (and we still as an article of faith believe in the validity of its goals as we believed then in the essentiality of including a non-western or other - cultures component in a liberal arts education long before the Stanford Debate) -- those same

administrative and ideological issues are alleged to be as intractable as I suggested they might be in 1982 when I opened the first NEH Seminar exclusively devoted to launching that course. Although changes in pedagogy and procedures have insinuated themselves or been introduced into the course, and, while there is a track record of successful faculty teams and integrated sections and student appreciation, the Core 9 teaching faculty have long been impatient about the institution's inability to come to grips with the administrative issues and polarities of outlook in a way that will lead to consensus and answer the questions (also raised by the evaluation) of making a course, team-taught by three area specialists, a coherent general education experience for students.

In conclusion, let me return to the theme of the Brooklyn College Core Curriculum Crossroads and share with you what I believe we need to come to terms with in 1988-89, which is part of the assignment I must assume according to the title in the program (and I have been urged to be bold enough to speculate on where we might be in five years). Before making a summative assessment, I would like to share some of my thoughts and some questions with you before I retire from this College. Our core, which has just completed its 7th year, is still alive and kicking and remains self-critical even hard on itself, while it is still attracting unsolicited national and international attention. Being as close to its problems as I have been, I worry about its living up to that image which was not and could not have been generated by our Public Relations office. Even Harvard's famed Summer Institute for Administrators solicited the use of the Brooklyn College core as its case study of institutional change, and the latest book on Higher Education and the Public Trust states that other institutions can learn from B.C.'s core. But why is the core still coming into being and sustaining our own faculty's interest? For even though we expanded the size of the seminar, we once again had to turn down applications.

I suggest two possible answers:

1) The Faculty Council Committee that designed the core program created an embryo with sufficient structure to withstand disintegration but with the individual courses only tentatively developed in content and methodology in order to allow flexibility for refinement and revision in the light of experience and the core's established goals. Like primitive protoplasm, the core we approved on paper was equipped with enough form to survive as an entity and enough flexibility to insure growth and perpetual life. Incidentally, we knew that the intellectual independence and pluralism of our faculty would provide the diversity of viewpoints and pedagogical nuances necessary to keep a common-experience core dynamic and its instructors alive. The committee's intention, or intuition, perhaps not as deliberate as it now seems, has obviously proved an asset.

2) Secondly, there must be some intrinsic reason why a program, which was aimed at improving the liberal arts foundation of our diverse student population and designed for our own institution's particular mission, has been viewed from its inception as an exemplary model. My answer to this big question rests on two characteristic features of the core model Faculty Council selected, viz., commonality and coherence, which remain our most difficult goals to achieve and maintain, and yet are the envy of those who admire our faculty's courage in hammering out a consensus even at the

sacrifice of some departmental and personal autonomy. It is in fact just because commonality and coherence are so difficult to achieve that they require (and indeed inspire) continuing dialogue and unending efforts to address the mandate of common experience among teachers of each of the core courses as well as require serious discourse and communication across the disciplines to find integrative links in order to produce a coherent program.

I have for years wrestled with the relative gains and losses of the commonality issue and believe that the gains have been worth the losses in some autonomy for the individuals who teach sections of a common course. For students all the material is new, as the evaluation report corroborates, except, according to student opinion, that American History is repeated in Core 4. The original objective of the core's creators was to make sure that there might be some nucleus, however small, of common content, methodologies, and vocabulary (an intellectual lingua franca, as I have called it), which teachers might count on and build on in the second tier of the core and in the majors and electives, so that intellectual dialogue, the heart of true education, might be possible. Thus every course would not have to be a beginning or elementary course based on the assumption of absolute ignorance. It can be argued that the first tier of common courses can provide the shared foundation, as in the later Lehman College model (on which I was consulted). Most of our first-tier courses and their faculty have been willing and successful on the basis of experience in scaling down ambitious syllabi and have introduced pedagogical strategies to provide in-depth learning experiences and more writing assignments in order to hone the less developed basic and analytical skills our freshman bring with them. These changes make obsolete some of the criticisms in the evaluation, although our inability to reduce class size in the first-tier courses in still an impediment to what could be achieved. I would strongly recommend that:

1) some commonality in every first tier course should be preserved in the interest of preserving the foundation on which the most worthy philosophical cornerstone of our common model is built; and

2) that class size be reduced to allow better implementation of the writing mandate.

Incidentally, it should be obvious that taking the ten courses in any old order, as so casually entertained in the evaluation report, would destroy the raison d'etre of the core and defeat its purposes. But we never intended that the second tier have the same function as the first tier, and I believe that any introduction of greater flexibility or rethinking should be directed primarily to the second tier of courses. This too is confirmed here and there in the evaluation report and with some student perceptions supporting it. But whatever refinements are entertained, on this occasion last year, I am reminded that I suggested the possibility of creating for the Freshman semester a small-seminar-format experience for every entering student to allow for more in-depth study and closer attention to college-level skills. It is in the College's Five-Year Plan, but sober assessment of the cost has given me pause. The issue of a senior seminar has long been postponed, but let me suggest for consideration the possibility of introducing alternative approaches that would be options in

the second tier (as some of the workshop sessions will consider) or perhaps a division into a second and third tier that would allow the liberal arts component to continue through the four years, not by default but by design. These are possibilities I see as options up the road, but any such revision requires careful weighing of the pros and cons over a period of time. It is interesting that on page 151 of the evaluation report a similar sentiment is expressed: a larger percentage of faculty sampled endorsed the existing common-experience core because it provides a common point of reference, a stable foundation on which faculty and students can rely in teaching elective or advanced courses, and some thought that it also combats vocationalism in students' programs. The smaller percentage who were for some flexibility envisaged a core with two layers or stages--the first a common-experience core followed by families of courses. In any case that even this minority view supported some common-experience foundation testifies that there is a consensus, now based on experience with the core, that confirms its original concept, purpose, and design, with commonality and coherence as its cornerstones.

While I am at it, let me cite two other findings of the report with regard to majority faculty assessments:

1. The single effect mentioned most frequently was the stronger sense of collegiality attributed to the core's giving the College a common purpose, central mission, direction, and framework around which key academic activities are organized (both College-wide and within some departments).

2. Another positive effect cited with respect to the faculty (and I would consider it even more important for the education of our students) was the core's stimulation of "A Renewed Interest in the Problems of Teaching" and "The Modification and Adapting of Teaching Methods and Styles to the Diversity of Students Taking the Core" that resulted from "a new sensitivity gained in meeting the needs of types of students they had not taught prior to the core."

Let me conclude by emphasizing that what still holds true is the lesson we learned early in the process of implementing an ambitious core curriculum: that curriculum development is meaningless without faculty development. It is that interdependence that we are here to insure during the next three days. I look forward to another demonstration of Brooklyn College's sense of community and commitment to improving that common portion of the curriculum that all our students share, that more than half our faculty teach, and that the rest of the faculty must depend on in terms of the foundation of knowledge and skills on which their majors and elective courses can be built. After all, the higher quality of critical skills students bring with them to their courses in the major, and the broader liberal arts context the core provides can only enhance the value of a student's specialized studies in the outside world. We especially welcome fresh inspiration from those of you who do not teach core courses and from our Summer Associates, those visitors who have contributed so much to our core's refinement and our faculty's development through the benefit of their open criticism. On behalf of the core's faculty and peer tutors, we urge you to become our partners and active participants as we struggle through the next three days to find solutions to recalcitrant curricular issues that are not local. There are high stakes and rewards for our students, for our faculty, and for institutions across the country in the way we handle this crossroads.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

CORE CURRICULUM PROJECT

F A C U L T Y D E V E L O P M E N T S E M I N A R

June 6 - June 10, 1988

Funded by

THE MELLON FOUNDATION and the

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Project Director:

Professor Ethyle R. Wolfe

Planning Committee:

Professors: Naomi Bushman
Charlton M. Lewis
Emily Michael
David Seidemann
Sherman Van Solkema, chair
Ethyle R. Wolfe

Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum:

	1987-88	1988-89
Professors:	David Arnow	Carolyn J. Burdick
	Sidney Aronson	Philip Gallagher
	Dee Ann Clayman	Marie Giuriceo
	Emily Michael	Emily Michael
	George S. Shapiro, chair	George S. Shapiro, chair

Core Course Coordinators:

	1987-88	1988-89
Professors:		
C.S. 1	Edward Harris	Frederick Winter
2.1	Patricia Mainardi	Patricia Mainardi
2.2	Nancy Hager	Carol Oja
3	George Vickers	Samuel Farber
4	Nicholas Papayanis	Nicholas Papayanis
5	Frederick Gardiner (Math)	Noemi Halpern (Math)
	Gerald Weiss (CIS)	Gerald Weiss (CIS)
6	Neil Schaeffer	Neil Schaeffer
7	Peter Brancazio	Peter Brancazio
8	Charlene Forest	David Seidemann
9	Bonnie Gustav	Virginia Sanchez-Korrol
10	Nanette Funk	Nanette Funk

Workshop Leaders

David Arnow	Margarite Fernandez-Olmos	James Levine
William Beer	George Fried	Charlton M. Lewis
Albert Bond	Vincent Fuccillo	Emily Michael
Naomi Bushman	Philip Gallagher	Robert Muccigrosso
Nehru E. Cherukupalli	Timothy Gura	Mary Oestereicher
Wendy Fairey	Nancy Hager	David Seidemann
	Noemi Halpern	Donez Xiques

VISITORS' INTRODUCTORY DAY

10:00-10:45	Plenary:	Opening Remarks: Ethyle R. Wolfe, Project Director
Morning Session Topic:		CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE
10:45-11:15	Plenary:	Short presentations by four chairpersons of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum (1980-89) Sherman Van Solkema (80-81) Ethyle R. Wolfe (81-82) Charlton M. Lewis (83-85) George S. Shapiro (87-89)
11:15-12:30	Workshops:	Members meet to discuss what needs to be done (and by whom) to create, implement, and maintain a Core Curriculum
	Task:	To identify the most critical factors for success in developing and implementing a Core Curriculum
	Product:	A written statement of the "most critical factors."

* * * *

12:30-1:30	Lunch	
1:45-2:30	Plenary:	Reports and discussion based on morning workshops.
	Coffee Break	
Afternoon Session Topic:		THE NATURE OF A CORE COURSE Chair, Emily Michael
2:30-4:00	Plenary:	Members of seminar Planning Committee sketch the "Five Principles" (see Introduction to the Core Curriculum, p. 5) and instructional modes (discipline-based, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, integrated modular, etc.) adopted for Brooklyn College core courses. General discussion of alternatives and issues--rhetoric and reality.

Brooklyn College
Faculty Development Seminar

FIRST DAY (Morning)

June 7, 1988

9:00-10:15 Plenary: "Core Curriculum Crossroads: 1988-89"
Ethyle R. Wolfe, Provost

Orientation to Tasks and Events:
Sherman Van Solkema,
Chair of the Planning Committee

* * * *

Morning Session Topic: THE CORE SEEN THROUGH STUDENTS' EYES
Chair, Wendy Fairey, Dean of the CLAS

10:30-12:00 Plenary: Panel Discussion: Peer Tutors
and Mary Oestereicher, Associate Dean, CLAS

Sharon Eisner	Core Studies 1
Rifka Wein	Core Studies 1
Jane Farb	Core Studies 3
Simone Wolfe	Core Studies 3
Christine Farrell	Core Studies 4
Pasqualino Russo	Core Studies 4
Jeffrey Kirsh	Core Studies 5
Michael McGuire	Core Studies 5

General Discussion

12:00-1:00 Lunch

FIRST DAY (Afternoon)
June 7, 1988

Afternoon Session Topic: UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH COMPARISON OF CULTURES: THE INTEGRATION OF CORE 9
Chair, Charlton M. Lewis

"Very large majorities of students perceived most Core courses as coherent and well integrated. [There were] two important exceptions to this general finding: Core Studies 9 and 5" (Raskin and Owen, p. 25).

"A general summary of the negative comments was expressed succinctly by one student: 'Core 9 was a nice idea which doesn't work.' There are several reasons, according to the students, why it doesn't work. First, covering three different countries makes the course so segmented and crammed with material that assimilation becomes very difficult.... Second, there frequently is marked unevenness in the quality of instruction among the three members of the teaching teams.... Third, team members do not successfully integrate their individual units of the course" (Raskin and Owen, p. 38).

"Three-fourths of the students in our combined samples feel that their understanding and respect for people with backgrounds different from their own had increased since entering college.... Among the Core courses, Core Studies 3 and 9 were singled out by students as being closely connected with this change..." (Raskin and Owen, p. 50).

1:00-2:15	Plenary:	Introduction to the problem. Two SAMPLERS to illustrate a thematic way to integrate Core 9 modules. 1. "Migration from Village to City: Africa" Marie Buncombe (English) 2. "Introducing India: Bengal--Rural and Urban, East and West." Leonard Gordon (History).
2:15-2:45	Plenary:	Questions and discussion of the problem. Charlton M. Lewis, Marie Buncombe, Leonard Gordon, Antonio Nadal.
2:45-3:45	Workshops:	Members meet to discuss the focusing and integration of Core 9.
	Task:	To examine what should be common to all modules of a Core 9 section to help students understand Asian, African, and Latin American cultures.
	Product:	Several written suggestions on how best to give students a coherent experience in Core 9.
3:45-4:45	Plenary:	Workshop reports and evaluation by members of the Core 9 faculty.
4:45		Wine and Cheese

SECOND DAY (Morning)
June 8, 1988

Topic: WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH SCIENCE
Chair, David Seidemann

"The serious pedagogical and administrative problems raised by the seven-week module courses are acknowledged by practically all members of the teaching faculty as well as being reflected in students' comments....Perhaps science courses in the Core Curriculum might more effectively serve their goals by focussing on contemporary issues in which scientific knowledge and ways of thought are entailed" (Raskin and Owen, p. 176).

CURRENT AND ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

9:00-9:30	Plenary:	Non-scientists' views of Core 7 and 8: Professors Bruce MacIntyre (Music) Manuel Martinez-Pons (Education) Nicholas Papayanis (History) Elisabeth Weis (Film)
9:30-10:00		Students' views of Core 7 and 8: Jeffrey Domfort Christine Farrell Michael Mcquire Heena Sultan
10:00-11:00	Plenary:	Presentation: "The Columbia U" model: "The Theory and Practice of Science", Roger Blumberg, Columbia College
11:00-11:15	Coffee Break	
11:15-12:15	Plenary:	Presentation: "The 'Thematic' Model," Brian Schwartz, Physics
12:30-1:30	Lunch	

SECOND DAY (Afternoon)
June 8, 1988

WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING THE WORLD THROUGH SCIENCE (cont.)

1:30-3:00 **Workshops:** Members meet to consider alternative approaches to teaching science in a general education curriculum.

Task:

1. To evaluate the relative effectiveness of different teaching models as described today and as seen in the Core 7 and 8 sessions that members attended during the semester.

2. To consider incorporating different teaching models into the current science program.

3. To consider any changes that would help to foster an understanding of science. Among the possible changes are:
   - -elimination of laboratories
   - -changes in Tier restrictions
   - -structural changes that promote better integration among the different science modules.

Product: A group statement (choose one or more of the following):

1. Identifying the strengths and weaknesses of alternative teaching models.

2. Naming and evaluating one or more ways to incorporate different teaching models into the program--e.g., offering students a choice among 2 or 3 alternative models in each course.

3. Suggesting and justifying changes in the structure of the science courses.

3:10-4:30 **Plenary:** Workshop reports and general discussion

4:30 Wine and Cheese

THIRD DAY (morning)
June 9, 1988

Morning Session Topic: WRITING AS ONE WAY TO UNDERSTANDING
Chair, Naomi Bushman

"Core Studies 1,3, and 6 were the ones which they considered most effective in improving writing ability. Substantial majorities of students reported that the writing assignments in Core Studies 2.1, 2.2, 5, and all four second-tier Core science courses had not improved their ability to write" (Raskin and Owen, p. 162).

9:00-10:15 Plenary: Writing Across the Core

Two SAMPLERS
Core 10, "Writing and Thinking Skills"
Emily Michael, Philosophy

Core 5, "Other Ways to Understanding"
Gerson Levin, Mathematics

10:15-11:30 Workshop: Members meet to discuss a particular Core course, the role of writing in that course, and the other means for achieving the goals of the course. (Groups will be assigned Core Studies 2.1, 2.2, 5, 7 & 8, or 9.)

Task: To define and identify specifically the skills you think are appropriate for this course: What new things should a student be able to do as a result of this course? To examine how and whether students' writing is necessary to the goals of the course. To look at other experiences and assignments that also serve the goals.

Product: For the course under discussion:
A statement identifying the skills and the role of writing (is it a means? an end?). What other ways can the goals be achieved? Include three classroom techniques and types of assignments.

11:45 Lunch: Workshop Reports

THIRD DAY (afternoon)
June 9, 1988

Afternoon Session Topic: A LIBERAL ARTS CORE AS STARTING POINT OR TERMINUS
Chair, Sherman Van Solkema

"The faculty have not chosen the common experience core because they think all students are (or should be) alike. Our position is exactly the opposite: the core is a starting point. The choice of this type of core is based on our deep belief in the power of common intellectual experience as a starting point for a distinctive college education" (Introduction to the Core Curriculum, p.5).

"Only a small minority of students had taken or intended to take a more advanced course in the same field as a Core course, except for Core Studies 3 and 5" (Raskin and Owen, p. 161).

1:00-2:00 Plenary: SAMPLER: Core 1, "Antigone"
Ethyle R. Wolfe, Classics

General discussion of whether not taking a post-Core elective should be taken as an indication that the Core is not serving as "a starting point and the relevance of this issue to the validity of our "belief in the power of common intellectual experience as a starting point for a distinctive college education."

2:00-3:00 Workshops: Members meet to discuss whether and how the Core can or should serve as a starting point for a liberal arts program. Some suggested barriers are:

-high credit major programs (primarily professional)
-free electives are not viewed as opening-up opportunities
-free electives are used to take introductory courses in many fields with no in-depth work done in any area other than the major
-core is stretched out over three or four years

Among the possible solutions to these barriers are:

-capping of major credits
-some required structure for free electives
-requiring a senior seminar

Task: To determine if there are significant barriers that limit the core as a starting point for life-long learning.

Product: Three changes that would enhance the Core's ability to meet its goal of serving as a starting point for a distinctive liberal arts education and life-long learning.

3:00-3:30 Plenary: Reports of workshop recorders and general discussion

3:30-4:30 Open Forum: Chair, Ethyle R. Wolfe, with current and incoming members of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum.

4:30 Final Reception

VISITORS' CLOSING DAY

Morning Session Topic: HOW DO YOU KNOW IF YOU'RE BEING SUCCESSFUL?

9:00-10:15	Plenary:	"Core Curriculum Assessment;" Tape of presentation by Robert L. Hess, President of Brooklyn College, to the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges, January, 1988
10:30-11:30	Workshops:	Members meet to discuss assessment models
	Task:	To consider what can and should be measured, and by what means.
	Product:	A written statement on means of measuring success in the year-to-year functioning of a core curriculum.
11:30-12:00	Plenary:	Reports and Discussion
12:00-1:00	Lunch	
1:15-2:30		Closing Forum

Brooklyn College Faculty Participants in the 1988 Seminar

AFRICANA STUDIES:	Cuthbert J. Thomas	
ART:	Lionel Bier	
BIOLOGY:	George H. Fried Raymond Gavin Marion Himes	Norman L. Levin Stanley Salthe
CHEMISTRY:	Vojtech Fried Gary Mennitt	George Moriber Evan Williams
CLASSICS:	Ethyle R. Wolfe	Peter Zaneteas
COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE:	David Arnow Michael P. Barnett	Naomi Bushman
ECONOMICS:	Robert Cherry	Hyman Sardy
EDUCATION:	Manuel Martinez-Pons	Jerome Megna
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES:	Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio Mary Oestereicher	David Walters
ENGLISH:	Louis Asekoff Martin Elsky Wendy Fairey	Tucker Farley Jules Gelernt Donez Xiques
FILM:	Elisabeth Weis	
GEOLOGY:	Nehru E. Cherukupalli David Leveson	David Seidemann
HEALTH SCIENCE:	Leslie Jacobson	
HISTORY:	Philip Gallagher Christoph M. Kimmich Ruth Kleinman	Charlton M. Lewis Robert Muccigrosso Nicholas Papayanis
MATHEMATICS:	Raymond Gittings Charles Godino	Noemi Halpern
MODERN LANGUAGES & LITERATURES:	Margarite Fernandez-Olmos	Tom Mermall
MUSIC:	Nancy Hager Bruce C. MacIntyre	Sherman Van Solkema
PHILOSOPHY:	Edward Kent	Emily Michael
PHYSICAL EDUCATION:	Phyllis Bigel	
PHYSICS:	Albert Bond Norma Eisen	Victor Franco

POLITICAL SCIENCE:	Vincent Fuccillo Michael Kahan	James Levine
PUERTO RICAN STUDIES:	Antonio Nadal	
SOCIOLOGY:	William Beer Mark Fishman	Marvin Koenigsberg
SPEECH:	Timothy Gura	
STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES:	Patricia Trant	

Summer Associates

Rev. Thomas E. Chambers, C.S.C.
Our Lady of Holy Cross College

Professor Anthony Colaianne
Virginia Tech

Professor Donald A. Cress
Northern Illinois University

Professor Patricia Silber
Marymount College

Professor Richard Fox
Suffolk Community College

Professor Robert J. Frankle
Memphis State University

Dr. A. Patricia J. Hennessey
Merrimack College

Professor Howard Horowitz
Ramapo College

Professor Manuel Schonhorn
Southern Illinois University

Professor Bettie M. Smolansky
Moravian College

Professor Bruce R. Stam
Chemeketa Community College

Professor Jo Taylor
Wayne State College

From the Peer Tutoring Program

Jeffrey Domfort
Sharon Eisner
Jane Farb
Christine Farrell
Jeffrey Kirsch
Michael McGuire
Pasqualino Russo
Heena Sultan
Rifka Wein
Simone Wolfe

CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE

Sherman Van Solkema, Chair
Committee on the Core Curriculum, 1980-81

For anyone who is involved with, or who would like to be involved with, creating a core curriculum, my first advice would be to consider carefully the positioning of the initial committee--and the charge given to it. At Brooklyn College, the five-person Ad Hoc committee of 1980 was put in place--it was elected--directly by the Faculty Council of the college. The 100-member Faculty Council is itself the all-college body finally responsible for decisions on curriculum. Ethyle Wolfe and George Shapiro were members with me of the Ad Hoc committee, and because they chaired later committees, you will hear from them shortly. Our historian Hans Trefousse will not be here this summer, but our scientist member, Vojtech Fried, you will surely meet at the conference beginning tomorrow. (The successive elected Committees we represent were at first Ad Hoc and then--on recommendation of the first committee--they became standing committees of The Faculty Council).

Our Ad Hoc committee was set up essentially as a drafting committee. I see this as very different from, say, an 18-person task force. On many campuses that I have seen, there is this 2-stage way of working--first the general exploration and then specific drafting. This may be a trouble spot that we could return to if you wish: How to move from broad task force recommendations to drafting a plan that will succeed.

As many of you know, we also had a prior committee--one that failed after a blue-ribbon, three-year effort), which was our version of the task force. What they produced ended up as so ordinary--so much the product perhaps of the large committee dynamic--that it could not pass. But failure galvanized the Council to commission a new Ad Hoc group, whose specific charge was to produce at least two complete alternative versions. We had at least learned that a proposal had to be complete before it could be assessed. We worked fast. Beginning in May, we developed not two but three different Core proposals, the best of which (the one you know) they adopted in November. (That's six months later). The <u>overall</u> proposal was adopted at that time. We presented our ten new courses with tentative syllabi for information in November, for adoption "in principle only." After November, they were further refined, and they were approved in their specific versions in February (3 months later). We began teaching the first tier courses in September of the same year (that is, 15 months from the time we were elected).

The first critical issue--and the most important in my view--is establishing a "vision of what could be"; the rest has to do with propagating the vision. We needed a core proposal that was exciting and would capture the imagination of a <u>large</u> faculty for whom it would mean a lot of work and considerable change. It had to be in tune with the philosophies we had come to know in the previous year's debate. But, even more, for a disillusioned and demoralized faculty, it had to promise an educational <u>result</u>. Hence our tier system; and hence our fixed set of ten courses.

I see five stages of work for the first committee:

Stage 1: Creating a vision of what might be within the committee.

Stage 2: Discussing the roughed-out proposals beyond the committee: with associates, students, concerned administrators--whoever might help--to try to maximize the power and interest of the set of courses and to anticipate and minimize the hangups that would certainly be met.

Stage 3: A more formal step: Presenting sketched-out proposals to the "potential teaching faculty" (whether drawn from a single department or a combination of departments) trying to make the point that we wished the "potential teaching faculty" to take our sketch and create the actual course.

We considered it essential for the faculty to understand that the courses were to be created by them: That we were trying to create an integrating framework that would work at Brooklyn College, but that it would be their responsibility (within this framework) to make the most potent courses they could conceive for the purpose. Obviously we needed and respected their expertise. But then we went back and forth on what they proposed. Sometimes, many times. The tentative syllabi we ended up with--after this back and forth motion--went in November for information in an appendix to Council.

Before the crucial "adoption in principle" vote in November, the main work of the committee reverted again to the "vision of what could be." By this time we had a fairly detailed idea. Members of the committee and many others worked to communicate this vision.

Stage 4: The administration played a crucial role throughout the process by critiquing and supporting the developing proposals and even more by assuring that departments would be protected from immediate shifts of personnel. Fear is deadly and has to be faced.

Stage 5: After the structure had been adopted in November, the entire campus (or at least, in our case, more than half of the full faculty) was brought together in searching all-campus discussions of the individual courses. We had 9 (2-hour) sessions in an 8-day period, some of the most exciting days many of us have had in decades of teaching. As a launching program and means of refinement and strengthening--and as a first bringing together of the faculty (of which these development seminars seem to me a continuation) they were a huge success.

My hope is that as we work now toward a 2nd edition of the Core, under George's leadership, that we will follow something of this same procedure. I speak of a "2nd edition" of the core because I hope it will again be based on a unified vision of what might be, on campus-wide discussion, with students, faculty, and administrators woven into the critique process at every stage.

In the initial committee we looked ahead to some of the needed machinery--the standing committee and the net work of coordinators--but I will stop here. As you listen now to Ethyle Wolfe, you will hear a good deal more about implementation.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE

Ethyle R. Wolfe, Chair
Committee on the Core Curriculum, 1981-82

The most dangerous period in the life of a new curriculum is its launching, especially when consensus of the faculty on its form and content has been miraculously achieved and enthusiastic college-wide approval follows. This is the time when it may appear that the battle is won, but it is the time when real work begins and the real test comes.

In 1981 when I was the first faculty member elected to chair the first standing committee on the core, I was faced with the formidable responsibility of directing the implementation of the new college-wide core curriculum. (This is usually the responsibility of a Dean or Director of General Education on other campuses.) Sections of the first tier of courses Core Studies 1 through 5 had to be taught to all the eligible entering freshman, while an ongoing process of refining the syllabi of the five second-tier courses and getting them ready for implementation the next year would have to go on simultaneously. All we on the core committee who had to administer the program had was a core on paper, ten new coordinators for each course appointed by the President, and members of the faculty facing the firing line as test pilots on a new adventure under the watchful eyes of the whole college, which was concerned about the risks of failing the hopes we had that the new core would provide a better education for our students. The premature publicity the core received during that first year was more disconcerting than helpful. An article on the front page of the New York Times, hailing Brooklyn College, Harvard, and Stanford as national leaders in core curriculum reform, brought home to me the realization that favorable publicity would have nothing to do with making the core work for our students, which I was level-headed enough to know should always be our one and only objective. Two of us who had served in the original ad hoc committee were elected to the first standing committee, and we took up our charge, armed only with commitment to and understanding of the program we had helped to create. All too aware that the cornerstone of the new curriculum rested on the twin concepts of commonality and coherence I had helped give birth to (either as midwife or mother -- after all I was the only female on the original committee), I knew that the challenge facing us at Brooklyn College was how to turn this common-experience core we had designed into the coherent foundation it was intended to be for students. I knew that it could not happen unless we, the faculty, were converted into a coherent cadre of teachers committed to making it work and willing to give up some of our autonomy to achieve an institutional goal. Despite a full load of commitments to teaching and to my role as Executive Officer of a newly hyperactive Humanities Institute demanding my attention, I, as Chair, nevertheless decided that, given the college's depressed budget, I had to find time to write a grant proposal so that we could secure funds to bring core faculty together during the next summer to learn about each other's courses and to seek ways to interrelate them and forge a coherent program that would work for the students. So the concept of a core faculty development project became my one and only hope.

After I received a grant, for core faculty development, we spent the whole Spring term on planning the first Summer Seminar. There had been no

time to do this for the first-tier pioneers but I was sure that their experience, under the aegis of the Core Committee, of collaborating across the first-tier courses during that first academic year in efforts to connect the courses through horizontal cross-referencing and to interrelate content, themes, and analytical skills would be useful to the prospective second-tier faculty. Also, during that same year, the committee collected and distributed syllabi to be shared and discussed among the faculty in the different courses. As a first step toward fulfilling the writing-across-the-core requirement, the Director of the College's Writing Center was enlisted from the start to work with core faculty on writing assignments. Visits to the Center by groups of faculty were arranged by the Core Committee, and invitations for her to speak at department meetings became legion.

The faculty of the pre-core remedial and developmental programs were invited to Core Committee meetings. ESL faculty members asked us to arrange for their visits to core classes and on their own initiative sought but did not succeed in gaining external funding to redesign their programs based on the core. The developmental courses were revised to include content from first-tier core courses, and the remedial faculty asked the Committee to consider the creation of a glossary of terminology and sample writing assignments from core courses so that they could target the student's work to prepare them for the first-tier courses. We even arranged paired sections of core courses for the Scholars Program (the College's Honors Program).

Core coordinators were urged to meet with the faculty of other core courses and met frequently as a group and with the Committee. A network of coordinators was almost spontaneously generated by their desire to learn from each other. The members of the first Core Committee, having no precedents to follow and only a rather broad charge, acted as cheer leaders and monitors and as catalysts and agents of good will. They established guidelines for governance and budgetary issues that had not been anticipated in terms of liaison with the Office of the Vice President and other administrators. Widespread faculty dialogue, generated by the previous Spring's college-wide seminar had to be sustained and was continued at fever pitch. But the strategy that made all the difference in getting us off to a good start was the first Summer Core Faculty Development Seminar. That is where our core process was born, which continues to keep our core a work in progress.

So What Did I Learn In That First Year Of Our Core's Life?

1. The process of implementing an institutional academic program that is not the property of academic departments requires first and foremost, pro-active faculty leadership (i.e., keeping the heat on, their colleagues), as well as courage, sacrifice, patience, and collegiality.

2. Bridges must be built to include students and administrators so that a community of discourse around the core will give a sense of common mission.

3. We learned there is no deadwood in the faculty - that it can be ignited and make the best kindling. And the best way to revitalize teachers

is to engage in the challenging and unending task of delivering a program made up of brand new courses whose goals of coherence and commonality require constant discussion across the disciplines to arrive at a consensus.

4. To paraphrase Socrates, the unexamined life is not worth living and that faculty are the best vehicle for examining and reexaming what is to be taught. Out of them will come new strategies and creative ideas if their topics and tasks involve faculty in substantive discussion and debate about intellectual content and sharing pedagogical alternatives. The unexamined curriculum is not worth teaching.

5. As Aristole said, the beginning is half of the whole and I believe that beginning with faculty development is a sine qua non for development of a successful curriculum.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE

Charlton M. Lewis, Chair
Committee on the Core Curriculum, 1983-85

A general education curriculum does not run itself.
Faculty must tend it: a form of development.
Crucial consolidation period.

First year issues.

1. Following up on Faculty Development.
   Core samplers (we got them launched); a core dinner; writing workshops.

2. Structure: (1) tiers vs. sequencing.
   1-6-10; 4-3-9; 5-7-8. Retreat to more discipline-based curriculum.

   (2) Job description for Coordinators. May '84.
   Confirmation of no need for Core Czar.

3. Budget -- issue of faculty involvement in administration.

4. Counseling. Met with President, Provost. Later drew up long memo on how to integrate counseling with core.

5. Evaluation. An issue from start. Early preoccupation with getting good teaching in core. Seeking informal means to elicit student views. Got patterns of enrollment and attrition from Dean. Placed letters in school papers seeking student opinion. Few responses.

6. Science courses--good example of need for evaluation. Experiment of running modules simultaneously. Not back to back. Faculty urged it; our own poll showed students unhappy. In the end we abolished it.

Second year issues.

1. Faculty Development.

   Samplers not well attended (later integrated into Visitors Program.
   Core Conversations-- successes with Dante, Marx, Bach.

2. Structure okay--has remained intact.

3. Course problems
   * Core 3 -- squabble over political content of readings.

   * Core 6 -- conflict between English and Comp. Lit. over content. Bitter: finally favored English

     Paired sections. (Provost's initiative) Early attempts to evaluate their success.

   * Guidelines for experimental sections, 4/85.

4. Bureaucratic procedures frustrating many students. Bitter complaints in AAC. Students turned off.

   Met with Faculty Council Committee on Course and Standing.

   Counseling issue raised again.

   Articulation with other institutions - the issue of transfer students.

5. Evaluation. A major issue among many faculty who still were dubious about core.

   Culminated in spring; persuaded administration to set aside funds for professional evaluation.

   Could compare 1st cohort of Core grads with control group of their immediate non-core predecessors.

   Learned enormous complexity of accumulating and evaluating data.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN DEVELOPING A CORE

George Shapiro, Chair
Committee on the Core Curriculum, 1987-89

In some ways, the most important occurrence with respect to the Core Curriculum during 1987-88 was the appearance of the "Evaluation of the Core Curriculum" prepared by Professors Evelyn Raskin and David Owen. This report has been commissioned some years earlier jointly by President Hess and the Steering Committee of Faculty Council. Many proposals for change in the Core had been deferred pending receipt of the report.

Topics with which the committee dealt during the year can, for the most part, be divided into technical proposals to deal with certain specific difficulties or with lack of clarity in existing regulations, and topics of a more fundamental, policy related nature. Let me briefly indicate the nature of some of the latter and the recommendations, if any, which the committee made concerning these:

Core Studies 9 - Studies in African, Asian and Latin American Cultures. This team taught course remains troubled. Despite very hard work by many faculty of good will this course suffers from both conceptual and administrative problems. Among other problems, teaching teams are often not selected early enough to allow for sufficient planning and integration. We met early in the year with Prof. Lewis (Chair of History) and Prof. Gustav (of Anthropology, Course Coordinator) who had run last summer's session on Core 9 and discussed some of the issues raised there. We, in turn, discussed some of the administrative problems in a meeting we had with the Provost.

In the Raskin Report, students are reported as finding the course both too fragmented and (perhaps consequently) too demanding. Late in the year, we met with the recently appointed Core 9 Advisory Committee and discussed possible alternative modes of structuring the course. We think that the development of some more uniform structure for the course must be an important agenda item for next year.

Students making the transition to mainstream courses. Many students at Brooklyn College are able to take Core Curriculum courses only after completion of certain required remedial or developmental courses. The Department of Educational Services (DES), the College's SEEK Department, has the responsibility for counselling (and teaching) many of these students. In December we held a joint meeting of counselors from DES and coordinators of first-tier courses, which, I feel, succeeded in doing some "consciousness raising" on both sides.

One of the suggestions made at the meeting was that compensatory sections of certain first-tier Core courses might be offered. These would be designed for students on the verge of entering the mainstream curriculum and, while covering the same material as standard sections, would meet for more weekly hours allowing for a slower pace and for more discussion in class of learning skills. The Committee was, however, not supportive of the idea of such sections except, possibly, in certain clearly defined situations.

Science Core Courses. There had been various criticisms of the Science Core courses, their seven week format, and the perceived lack of integration between the lectures and the laboratory sessions. Many proposals had been made for reconceptualizing the entire science component of the Core, with a view toward better integration (e.g., teaching from a historical perspective). The Committee met with all the science Core Coordinators and found that they were not so unhappy with their (particular) courses but would have liked the freedom to experiment a bit within the framework of the current course descriptions. The Science coordinators and chairpersons all felt that the seven week, paired format was too constricting and the committee, therefore, approved their proposal to be allowed to offer the courses on a fourteen week basis, uncoupled from one another, starting in 1988-89. (The Raskin report later confirmed the feeling that many students were unhappy with the seven week format.)

We have requested reports on any innovations that take place. We have also requested that the science chairs convene a working group to consider possible future directions for the science in the Core.

Core Studies 5. This course is sponsored jointly by the Departments of Mathematics and of Computer and Information Science. In 1987-88, four experimental versions (approved the previous year after long discussions) of the course were run along with the "standard" version. These experiments are still being evaluated, but seemed mostly to have been positively received by students and faculty. The committee authorized continuation of the experiments for another semester but requested that in the early part of Fall, 1988 some formal proposal for the future direction of the course be drafted by its faculty.

Retroactive pass. After studying the Raskin Report and noting that many students were unhappy with the very prescriptive nature of our Core Curriculum, the Committee revived, in somewhat altered form, a proposal for "retroactive grades of P (pass)" which had been deferred in previous years. Specifically, Faculty Council recently approved our proposal that a student be allowed to have his/her passing grade in up to two Core courses changed from a letter grade to a P provided that he/she elects this option no later than the semester after that in which he/she completes his 96th credit. (The purpose of the proviso was to induce students to complete their Core requirements earlier in their college careers.)

There were many more issues discussed and not resolved to any extent. Some agenda items for next year (listed in no particular order):

Core Studies 9

The Science Core courses

The Foreign Language requirement (A proposal both to strengthen this requirement and make it more uniform is being studied by both the Core and Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.)

Core Studies 5

Writing Across the Core (again!)

Creating a coherent procedure for exemption of well-prepared students from certain Core courses

87

VISITORS' FIRST DAY WORKSHOPS

Ethyle R. Wolfe	Sherman Van Solkema	Charlton M. Lewis
David Seidemann	Naomi Bushman	Emily Michael
** Thomas E. Chambers	** Richard Fox	** Anthony Colaianne
Manuel Schonhorn	Robert J. Frankle	Donald A. Cress
Bruce R. Stam	Howard Horowitz	Patricia J. Hennessey
Jo Taylor	Bettie M. Smolansky	Patricia Silber
Rooms: Breukelen	Ditmas	Knickerbocker

** Recorder and Reporter

June 6, 1988

Visitors' First-Day Workshop
Thomas Chambers, Recorder

Participants of Group I dealt with where they had been and where they are now. The "Brooklyn College Core" has assisted the participants to be where they are "now." One University has a choice of three "column" distributions; the choice is made by the student. The total amount is 30 credit hours. The next participant said that three courses have been established: 1) World Literature, 2) Ethics and Values, and 3) Science and Technology. These three courses are required (nine hours) and then there are 43 hours which are part of the distribution. Lastly, a community college which requires 18 credit hours in a distribution framework and a new "multidisciplinary" course.

The group focused on three essentials for "core" success. They are:

1. Leadership for implementation. This leadership can come from faculty, administration, or both.

2. Faculty have to overcome insulation and isolation. Conversation between disiplines is critical for success.

3. The "Core" when written must be strategically launched.

Each college/university has to clearly know institutional "mission" and "Philosophy." It is important to have all students have the same academic experience.

June 6, 1988

Visitors' First-Day Workshop
Richard Fox, Recorder

Three of the four institutions represented had accepted the Core model, drafted a specific curriculum, and were seeking to implement their programs. Moravian College, a small private liberal arts college, chose the Davidson College Humanities model which calls for two paired full year courses in Western Culture and Communications. There are three additional courses in the sophomore year in Quantification, Global Issues, and a science course taught from historical perspectives. Memphis State's program provides a basic skills Core of the two writing courses and one course each in speech, mathematics, literature and health. Students then go on to satisfy distribution requirements in eight categories. Students select one course from four to seven choices in each category. Ramapo College also follows a mixed Core-distribution model in its general education program that takes over one-half of a student's credits required for graduation. Core courses have been developed in Western Studies, Social Issues, College English, the Development of Modern Science, an upper-level interdisciplinary course in Values, Ethics, and Culture, and a proposed course "The Western Discovery of the World." Ramapo founded in the 1960's as an interdisciplinary experiment built around four to five "schools, has a long tradition of a Core program to build upon. The last college represented in the workshop, Suffolk Community College, is a large, multi-campus, comprehensive community college that is conveniently strengthening its distribution model on one campus while another campus is exploring faculty acceptance of a Core model.

The most important critical issue we identified was the need for positive faculty involvement. Introducing a Core requires strong imput from faculty in at least three stages of gradually widening active faculty participation: in general discussions on the selection of the Core Curricular model, in the specific drafting of a very concrete Core curriculum appropriate to the needs and strengths of the institution and in the actual implementation of the Core by the faculty in the classroom. Suffolk was still seeking a critical mass of faculty prepared to advocate the core model. The other three colleges had specific programs drafted and were concerned with implementation. Moravian dealt with implementation by limiting its Core to approximately one-quarter of its students body that could be expanded at a later date. Memphis State made implementation easier by awarding controversial issues, making only about one-quarter of the required courses new courses, and by planning interdisciplinary alternatives for its distribution requirements. Ramapo is having difficulties with the Core courses it has developed and is suffering from lowered faculty morale as a result of an increase in the teaching load. In the three successful cases, the reform was a grassroots faculty movement that was well supported by the administration.

Another critical issue that emerged from our discussions was the need for greater faculty development. The need was acute at Moravian and Ramapo where interdisciplinary and team taught courses had been created. At Ramapo, faculty felt deflated after the end of five years of state funded curricular reforms. Although there was no released time given at Brooklyn, it was agreed that funding was desirable particularly in those cases where faculty were asked to teach outside of their original specialities. Summer workshops were considered crucial. At Memphis State, for example, there was still a serious need to explore ways to integrate the experiences in the distributional categories.

In the initial phase of selecting a curriculum model, Moravian and Memphis State had contrasting experiences. Moravian, like Brooklyn College, found that small committees united by a common vision worked best; the original committee of eleven contained two opponents of the Core idea who frustrated the work of the committee. Memphis State, however, found that a large committee worked well in the selection phase because consensus on that committee produced near consensus for reform among the faculty at large. A group of eight then formed the General Education Committee which proceeded to the drafting phase. The Brooklyn experience may not be easy to duplicate since the Brooklyn Core Committee began its work with a Core model already mandated.

The Memphis State experience was also instructive in terms of where those interested in reform could expect to find support. At Memphis the most senior faculty were likely to get involved in curricular reform and to view their participating as a means for personal and professional renewal. Senior faculty, more concerned with tenure and their own research, tended to remain distant from the reform process. Furthermore, the faculty in the vocational and professional schools tented to be very supportive of efforts to strengthen liberal learning among their students and became important allies in winning support for reform. At the same time, many of the same faculty were very concerned about the need for assessment and objective evaluation of a Core liberal arts program just as they were obliged in their courses to meet specific professional standards. This leads to the final phase of the curricular reform process, assessment, which will be discussed on Friday.

June 6, 1988

Visitors' First-Day Workshop
Anthony Colaianne, Recorder

We focused on critical issues of a general nature, and, as they emerged, noted the particular kinds of problems we have at our own institutions which range from small liberal arts schools (Marymount and Merrimack) to large state institutions (Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois).

We focused on seven major areas of concern.

1. Motivating the faculty to teach in the core without additional incentives like released time (a problem at my institution, Virginia Tech).

2. The problem of pre-professional programs which desire to get their students on track early, and therefore see the core as distracting (Marymount).

3. Strained faculty/administration relationships and ways to ameliorate these.

4. The need to develop and articulate an educational vision the faculty can share with energy/enthusiasm.

5. The problems that result from tinkering with institutional economics by collapsing departmental barriers (writing programs are expensive, for example).

6 Political problems in making distinctions among the primary of disciplines--given a pluralistic curriculum, how do we dicide what is core, we must get above the particular/political problems to a theoretical plan.

7. Evaluation and assessment--long term effects of the core.

Another way of looking at the problems is this which follows the sequence of development:

1. Practical problems--motivation
2. Content issues--what is core
3. The design of the core

FIRST DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

Morning Session:

Plenary Recorder: George Moriber

Afternoon Session:

David Arnow (CIS-5)
Thomas E. Chambers (Sum Assoc)
Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio (Ed Svcs)
Raymond Gittings (Math-5)
Marion Himes (Bio-8.1)
* Marvin Koenigsberg (Soc-3)
David Leveson (Geo-8.2)
Michael McGurie (Tutor)

Rooms: University

Albert Bond (Phys-7.2)
Anthony Colaianne (Sum Assoc)
Tucker Farley (Eng-6)
Vincent Fuccillo (Poli Sci-3)
Charles Godino (Math-5)
* Norman L. Levin (Bio-8.1)
Jerome Megna (Ed)
Pasqualino Russo (Tutor)

407

Naomi Bushman (CIS-5)
Phyllis Bigel (Phys Ed)
Donald A. Cress (Sum Assoc)
Jules Gelernt (Eng-6)
Michael Kahan (Poli Sci-3)
* Stanley Salthe (Bio-8.1)
Heena Sultan (Tutor)
David Walters (Ed Svcs)

ROOMS: 408

Nehru E. Cherukupalli (Geo-8.2)
William Darden (Sum Assoc)
Vojtech Fried (Chem 7.1)
Philip Gallagher (Hist-4)
James Levine (Poli Sci-3)
Bettie Smolansky (Sum Assoc)
Rifka Wein (Tutor)
Elisabeth Weis (Film)
** Donez Xiques (Eng-6)

Alumni

Margarite Fernandez-Olmos (Lang-9)
Wendy Fairey (Eng-6)
Richard Fox (Sum Assoc)
Leslie Jacobson (Hlth Sci)
Ruth Kleinman (Hist-4)
* Gary Mennitt (Chem-7.1)
Bruce R. Stam (Sum Assoc)
Cutbert Thomas (Afr Studies-9)
Simone Wolfe (Tutor)

ROOMS: Maroney-Leddy

George Fried (Bio-8.1)
Lionel Bier (Art-2.1)
Jeffrey Domfort (Tutor)
Robert J. Frankle (Sum Assoc)
Nancy Hager (Mus-2.2)
Charlton M. Lewis (Hist-4)
Thomas Mermall (Lang-9)
** George Moriber (Chem-7.1)

Oriental

FIRST DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS (cont.)

Timothy Gura (Speech)
Sharon Eisner (Tutor)
* Ray Gavin (Bio-8.1)
Patricia J. Hennessey (Sum Assoc)
Bruce C. MacIntyre (Mus-2.2)
Emily Michael (Phil-10)
Robert Muccigrosso (Hist-4
Evan Williams (Chem-7.1)

ROOMS: Occidental

Noemi Halpern (Math-5)
Robert Cherry (Eco)
Norma Eisen (Phys-7.2)
Jane Farb (Tutor)
Howard Horowitz (Sum Assoc)
Edward Kent (Phil-10)
Nicholas Papayanis (Hist-4)
Sherman Van Solkema (Mus-2.2)
* Peter Zaneteas (Clas-1)

Knickerbocker

Mary Oestereicher (Ed Svcs)
** Louis Asekoff (Eng-6)
William Beer (Soc-3)
Christine Farrell (Tutor)
Victor Franco (Phys-7.2)
Antonio Nadal (P.R. Studies)
Hyman Sardy (Eco)
Jo Taylor (Sum Assoc)
Ethyle R. Wolfe (Clas-1)

Rooms: Ditmas

David Seidmann (Geo-8.2)
** Michael P. Barnett (CIS-5)
Martin Elsky (Eng-6)
Mark Fishman (Soc-3)
Jeffrey Kirsch (Tutor)
Manuel Martinez-Pons (Ed.)
Patricia Trant (St. Affairs & Svcs)
Manuel Schonhorn (Sum Assoc.)

Breukelen

* Recorder

** Recorder and Reporter

Plenary Recorder: Martin Elsky

SECOND DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

Morning Session:

Plenary Recorder: Thomas Mermall

Afternoon Session:

William Beer (Soc-3)
Thomas E. Chambers (Sum Assoc)
Nehru E. Cherukupalli (Geo-8.2)
Noemi Halpern (Math-5)
Jeffrey Kirsch (Tutor)
Bruce MacIntyre (Mus-2.2)
Manuel Martinez-Pons (Ed)
George Moriber (Chem-7.1)
* Patricia Trant (Studt Affs & Svcs)

ROOMS: University

Wendy Fairey (Eng-6)
Phyllis Bigel (Phys Ed)
Anthony Colaianne (Sum Assoc)
David Leveson (Geo-8.2)
Michael McGuire (Tutor)
* Jerome Megna (Ed)
Sherman Van Solkema (Mus-2.2)
Evan Williams (Chem-7.1)

407

Vincent Fuccillo (Poli Sci-3)
Albert Bond (Phys-7.2)
Robert Cherry (Eco)
Donald A. Cress (Sum Assoc)
Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio (Ed Svcs)
Mark Fishman (Soc-3)
** Ruth Kleinman (Hist-4)
Pasqualino Russo (Tutor)
David Seidemann (Geo-8.2)

ROOMS: 408

Philip Gallagher (Hist-4)
Norma Eisen (Phys 7.2)
Robert J. Frankle (Sum Assoc)
George H. Fried (Bio-8.1)
** Christoph M. Kimmich (Hist-4)
Marvin Koenigsberg (Soc-3)
Mary Oestereicher (Ed Svcs)
Bettie M. Smolansky (Sum Assoc)
Heena Sultan (Tutor)

Alumni

Nancy Hager (Mus 2.2)
Victor Franco (Phys 7.2)
Richard Fox (Sum Assoc)
Ray Gavin (Bio-8.1)
* Michael Kahan (Poli Sci-3)
Nicholas Papayanis (Hist-4)
Jo Taylor (Sum Assoc)
David Walters (Ed Svcs)
Rifka Wein (Tutor)

ROOMS: Maroney-Leddy

James Levine (Poli Sci-3)
David Arnow (CIS-5)
Louis Asekoff (Eng-6)
William Darden (Sum Assoc)
Marion Himes (Bio-8.1)
Cutbert J. Thomas (Africana Studies-9)
* Elisabeth Weis (Film)
Simone Wolfe (Tutor)

Oriental

SECOND DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS (cont.)

Charlton M Lewis (Hist-4)
Michael Barnett (CIS-5)
** Lionel Bier (Art-2.1)
Jeffrey Domfort (Tutor)
Martin Elsky (Eng-6)
Patricia J. Hennessey (Sum Assoc)
Leslie Jacobson (Hlth Sci)
Norman Levin (Bio-8.1)
Antonio Nadel-(P.R. Studies)

ROOMS: Oriental

Emily Michael (Phil-10)
Naomi Bushman (CIS-5)
Sharon Eisner (Tutor)
** Tucker Farley (Eng-6)
Margarite Fernandez-Olmos (Lang-9)
Howard Horowitz (Sum Assoc)
Stanley Salthe (Bio-8.1)
Peter Zaneteas (Clas-1)

Knickerbocker

Robert Muccigrosso (Hist-4)
Jane Farb (Tutor)
Vojtech Fried (Chem-7.1)
Jules Gelernt (Eng-6)
Raymond Gittings (Math-5)
* Thomas Mermall (Lang-9)
Bruce R. Stam (Sum Assoc)
Ethyle R. Wolfe (Clas-1)

ROOMS: Ditmas

Donez Xiques (Eng-6)
Christine Farrell (Tutor)
Charles Godino (Math-5)
Timothy Gura (Speech)
Edward Kent (Phil-10)
* Gary Mennitt (Chem-71.)
Hyman Sardy (Eco.)
Manuel Schonhorn (Sum Assoc)

Breukelen

* Recorder

** Recorder and Reporter

Plenary Recorder: Charles Godino

THIRD DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

Morning Session:

David Arnow (CIS-5)
* Norma Eisen (Phys-7.2)
Christine Farrell (Tutor)
Nancy Hager (Mus-2.2)
David Leveson (Geo-8.2)
Manuel Schonhorn (Sum Assoc)
Bruce R. Stam (Sum Assoc)
Cuthbert J. Thomas (Afr St)
(Core Studies 2.2)

ROOMS: University

Naomi Bushman (CIS-5)
Louis Asekoff (Eng-6)
Anthony Colaianne (Sum Assoc)
Victor Franco (Phys-7.2)
Edward Kent (Phil-10)
Michael McGuire (Tutor)
** Hyman Sardy (Eco)
Sherman Van Solkema (Mus-2.2)
(Core Studies 9)

ROOMS: 408

Margarite Fernandez-Olmos (Lang-9)
William Darden (Sum Assoc)
** Mark Fishman (Soc-3)
Raymond Gittings (Math-5)
Norman L. Levin (Bio-8.1)
Jerome Megna (Ed)
Antonio Nadal (P.R. Studies)
Heena Sultan (Tutor)

(Core Studies 7 and 8)

ROOMS: Maroney-Leddy

Albert Bond (Phys 7.2)
Michael P. Barnett (CIS-5)
Thomas E. Chambers (Sum Assoc)
** Leslie Jacobson (Hlth Sci)
Jeffrey Kirsh (Tutor)
Thomas Mermall (Lang-9)
Bruce C. MacIntyre (Mus-2.2)
Nicholas Papayanis (Hist-4)
Jo Taylor (Sum Assoc)
(Core Studies 2.2)

407

Nehru E. Cherukupalli (Geo-8.2)
William Beer (Soc-3)
Donald A. Cress (Sum Assoc)
Martin Elsky (Eng-6)
Gary Mennitt (Chem-7.1)
* Marion Himes (Bio-8.1)
Pasqualino Russo (Tutor)
Peter Zaneteas (Clas-1)
(Core Studies 5)

Alumni

George H. Fried (Bio-8.1)
Wendy Fairey (Eng-6)
** Vojtech Fried (Chem-7.1
Richard Fox (Sum Assoc)
Charles Godino (Math-5)
Manuel Martinez-Pons (Ed)
Bettie M. Smolansky (Sum Assoc)
Patricia Trant (Student Affairs & Svcs)
Rifka Wein (Tutor)
(Core Studies 5)

308

THIRD DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS (cont.)

Timothy Gura (Speech)
* Phyllis Bigel (Phys Ed)
Tucker Farley (Eng-6)
Robert J. Frankle (Sum Assoc)
Christoph M. Kimmich (Hist-4)
Marvin Koenigsberg (Soc-3)
Stanley Salthe (Bio-8.1)
Simone Wolfe (Tutor)
(Core Studies 7 and 8)

Rooms: 309

Robert Mucciqrosso (Hist-4)
Sharon Eisner (Tutor)
Howard Horowitz (Sum Assoc)
Ruth Kleinman (Hist-4)
James Levine (Poli Sci-3)
George Moriber (Chem-7.1)
* David Walters (Ed Svcs)
Ethyle R. Wolfe (Clas-1)
Donez Xiques (Eng-6)
(Core Studies 9)

ROOMS: Ditmas

* Recorder

** Recorder and Reporter

Plenary Recorder: Jerome Megna

Noemi Halpern (Math-5)
Lionel Bier (Art-2.1)
* Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio (Ed Svcs)
Jeffrey Domfort (Tutor)
Vincent Fuccillo (Poli Sci-3)
Philip Gallagher (Hist-4)
Jules Gelernt (Eng-6)
Patricia J. Hennessey (Sum Assoc)
Ray Gavin (Bio-8.1)
(Core Studies 2.1)

Knickerbocker

David Seidemann (Geo-8.2)
Robert Cherry (Eco)
Jane Farb (Tutor)
Michael Kahan (Poli Sci-3)
Charlton M. Lewis (Hist-4)
Emily Michael (Philo-10)
* Elizabeth Weis (Film)
Evan Williams (Chem-7.1)

(Core Studies 2.1)

Breukelen

THIRD DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS

Afternoon Session:

William Beer (Soc-3)
Norma Eisen (Phys-7.2)
Jane Farb (Tutor)
Ray Gavin (Bio-8.1)
Ruth Kleinman (Hist-4)
Manuel Martinez-Pons (Ed)
* Antonio Nadal (PR-9)
Manuel Schonhorn (Sum Assoc)

ROOMS: University

Vincent Fuccillo (Poli Sci-3)
** David Arnow (CIS-5)
Anthony Colaianne (Sum Assoc)
Vinnie Marie D'Ambrosio (Ed Svcs)
Jeffrey Kirsh (Tutor)
Marvin Koenigsberg (Soc-3)
Norman Levin (Bio-8.1)
* Nicholas Papayanis (Hist-4)
Patricia Trant (St Affairs and Svcs)

ROOMS: 408

Nancy Hager (Mus-2.2)
Naomi Bushman (CIS-5)
* Robert Cherry (Eco)
William Darden (Sum Assoc)
Martin Elsky (Eng-6)
Vojtech Fried (Chem-7.1)
Cutbert J. Thomas (Afr St)
David Walters (Ed Svcs)

ROOMS: Maroney-Leddy

Wendy Fairey (Eng-6)
Thomas E. Chambers (Sum Assoc)
Wendy Fairey (Eng-6)
Christine Farrell (Tutor)
Mark Fishman (Soc-3)
* Victor Franco (Phys-7.2)
Timothy Gura (Speech)
Marion Himes (Bio-8.1)
Jerome Megna (Ed)

407

Philip Gallagher (Hist-4)
Michael P. Barnett (CIS-5)
Donald A. Cress (Sum Assoc)
Michael Kahan (Poli Sci-3)
Michael McGuire (Tutor)
Robert Muccigrosso (Hist-4)
Stanley Salthe (Bio-8.1)
Jo Taylor (Sum Assoc)
* Peter Zaneteas (Clas-1)

Alumni

James Levine (Poli Sci-3)
Lionel Bier (Art-2.1)
Tucker Farley (Eng-6)
Richard Fox (Sum Assoc)
** Raymond Gittings (Math-5)
Gary Mennitt (Chem-7.1)
Heena Sultan (Tutor)
Sherman Van Solkema (Mus-2.2)
Elisabeth Weis (Film)

Oriental

89

THIRD DAY WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS (cont.)

Charlton M. Lewis (Hist-4)
Nehru E. Cherukupalli (Geo-8.2)
Robert J. Frankle (Sum Assoc)
* Jules Gelernt (Eng-6)
Charles Godino (Math-5)
Leslie Jacobson (Hlth Sci)
Rifka Wein (Tutor)
Ethyle R. Wolfe (Clas-1)

Emily Michael (Phil-10)
Louis Asekoff (Eng-6)
Margarite Fernandez-Olmos (Lang-9)
Patricia J. Hennessey (Sum Assoc)
Christoph M. Kimmich (Hist-4)
* David Leveson (Geo-8.2)
George Moriber (Chem-7.1)
Bruce R. Stam (Sum Assoc)
Simone Wolfe (Tutor)

ROOMS: 309

Knickerbocker

Mary Oestereicher (Ed Svcs)
Jeffrey Domfort (Tutor)
Noemi Halpern (Math-5)
Thomas Mermall (Lang-9)
Hyman Sardy (Eco)
David Seidemann (Geo-8.2)
Bettie M. Smolansky (Sum Assoc)
** Evan Williams (Chem-7.1)

Donez Xiques (Eng-6)
Albert Bond (Phys-7.2)
Phyllis Bigel (Phys Ed.)
Sharon Eisner (Tutor)
George H. Fried (Bio-8.1)
Howard Horowitz (Sum Assoc)
** Edward Kent (Phil-10)
Bruce C. MacIntyre (Mus-2.2)

ROOMS: Ditmas

Breukelen

* Recorder

** Recorder and Reporter

Plenary Recorder: Marvin Koenigsberg

June 7, 1988

INTRODUCTION TO CORE 9 SESSIONS: PROBLEMS OF CORE 9
Charlton M. Lewis

This afternoon we focus on perhaps the most important course in the core curriculum, and one which, according to the Raskin Report, has received some rather low marks from students. You have some student reaction in the first two quotes on this afternoon's program. Before we move to our samplers, I want to try to explain briefly why this course is important, how it came into being, why it has not been doing well, and what we may be able to do about it. I hope to encourage you to think creatively about Core 9.

If you have been reading the papers, you have heard the drums of discontent sounding through the tropical forest of academe, premomitory warnings that some colleges around the country have not been giving students all they demand of "non-Western materials in general education courses. Here at Brooklyn College there are also signs of a rising interest in the Third World, missing since the 1970s. Perhaps it is because the Middle East preoccupies so many of our students; perhaps it is because our minority groups, feeling ostracized and powerless after eight years of Reagan, seek a renewed sense of identity. Whatever it is, those of us who were here in the late '60s, when pressures from students shattered our earlier curricular structure, tend to listen carefully when such winds begin to blow. Should that particular storm rise again at Brooklyn College, our greatest strength would be Core 9.

Fortunately Sherman Van Solkema and the committee that created our core realized that any curriculum of liberal learning must be global. The Core 9 that they developed is one of the most imaginative and challenging in the whole core. It is potentially a powerful instrument to address the ethnic, racial and religious schisms present on our campus and in our society. The Third quote from this afternoon's program shows that it has already had some success in this respect. That it has not been working better should arouse concern in every member of our faculty.

The course, as you probably know, is modular, team-taught and multi-disciplinary. It brings together in one classroom a team of three faculty members, each specializing in a different area. The course has been modified to break the world into four parts, Southern and Eastern Asia, the Middle East, Subsaharan Africa, and Latin America and the Carribean. Instructors take turns presenting their respective areas, and try to integrate their presentations topically or thematically so as to allow intercultural comparison. They try not always successfully to give each section of the course some kind of inner coherence, so that students will come away with a sense of common purpose in the study of diverse areas.

Why did we choose this rather remarkable format? I think there are two main reasons. One reason is that is seemed a good way to fulfill the purpose of the course as the committee conceived of it, which was: "to develop an appreciation of cultures other than one's own," and to foster "cultural empathy" and "a sense of cultural relativity" in students.

They wanted to avoid creating a situation where students could choose the area they wanted to study. This would have violated the notion of a common experience core, and it would have allowed Hispanics to choose courses on Puerto Rico, Blacks on Africa, Chinese, Koreans and Indians on Asia and so forth. The present format insures that all students, whatever their backgrounds, will confront at least one (and usually two) areas of the world that are wholly new to them. It also encourages the habit of thinking about cultures relatively. This is not to promote the notion of cultural relativity that Allan Bloom inveighs against in his book, The Closing of the American Mind, namely that the values and traditions of any one cultural system are equal to those of any other. On the contrary, it is to encourage us all, students and teachers alike, to reexamine our own values and traditions by comparing them analytically with those of other societies. We thus incorporate the wisdom of that crusty patriot, Rudyard Kipling, who says somewhere, "He knows not England who only England knows."

The second reason for the format of the course is that we must draw our instructors from a very diverse faculty. Many of them are professional area specialists, like me on China or Leonard Gordon on India. Others have built up a teaching speciality outside their own field, such as Pat Lander in Anthropology, whose research has been on Finland, but who has developed a proficiency on the Middle East. Some of us specialize in literature, like Marie Buncombe or Tony Nadal. Others are trained in political science or Modern Languages. We differ in area and discipline; we differ in our familiarity with the subjects we teach; and we differ obviously in personality. The question is how, as members of teaching teams, we can best work together to give our students a coherent experience.

I must note that our problem is partly administrative. Core 9 has fallen into a great crevasse between the faculty (who teach it and are responsible for its content) and the administration (which is responsible for assigning teaching parameters). No single authority has emerged to direct the course--neither the coordinator, the chairpersons of the several departments who staff it, nor the provost's office have been able to assert the necessary leadership. The reasons for this failure of leadership are partly structural, and of Byzantine complexity, and we shall not discuss them today. But the results are clear. Planning is poor; teams are often formed late; personalities conflict; communications fail; classes are too large; etc. Faculty morale has dropped, and the students express natural frustration. I now have real hope that these problems can be resolved. The core committee is taking a strong lead, a new coordinator is about to take over with support from both the faculty and the provost's office, and reform is in the air.

But serious pedagogical problems remain, which we must address this afternoon. To be blunt, we initiated Core 9 on the basis of a fallacy. The fallacy was that if we allowed each instructor to do what he/she can do best, and put three instructors together in a classroom, we would create a course. We did not really examine in advance how we would blend together in a student's mind the different geographies, climates, societies, governments, religions, philosophies, or art forms of three macro-regions such as Africa, Latin America, or India, Especially when

approached through three different disciplinary modes of analysis. That we have learned to integrate Core 9 modules to some extent has been through the efforts of dedicated teachers such as the two you will see this afternoon.

As you watch the two samplers, you may want to think about some of the following questions. What should be common to all modules of a Core 9 section? Should we require that each team adhere to certain prescribed themes, for example family, women, revolution, colonialism, kingship, or what? If so, how many? Is one theme for a section enough, or is it too restricting? How can we keep students from feeling overwhelmed with information? Are there any themes that might be required for all sections so as to give the whole course a greater commonality? We shall continue this plenary for half an hour after the samplers to clarify questions you may have. We hope for insights on this course.

The two samplers we shall now hear illustrate how a section might be integrated around <u>one theme</u> which frequently appears in Core 9. That is the experience of people, as individuals or as families, when, driven by forces beyond their control or comprehension, they migrate from the rural countryside to the town or city. Our first speaker is Professor Marie Buncombe, Professor of English, who has played an important role in the shaping of Core 9, and will speak to us on "Migration from Village to City: Africa."

Summary of Afternoon Plenary Session, June 7, 1988

Martin Elsky, Plenary Recorder

Professor Lewis introduced the discussion of Core Studies 9 by reporting significant negative student reaction to the course, a reaction which those involved with the course in its present state share. He recounted the background of the course, particularly its genesis in the perceived need to add a global perspective to the Core program and its relevance to ethnic and religious schisms in society and on campus. He proceeded to outline the two major problems of Core 9.

1. No leadership has emerged to give the course direction largely because its faculty are drawn from so many areas of the college;

2. There has been a serious failure to integrate the three modules of the course by the three-teacher teams who teach it, partly because faculty are sometimes assigned to the course at the last minute.

Professor Lewis offered the adoption of a set of common themes to be treated by the three instructors of all sessions as a possible solution to the problem of integrating the course.

As examples of this approach Professor Buncombe and Professor Gordon each presented a sampler on the topic of rural vs. urban life; Professor Buncombe dealt with the topic as it relates to Africa, Professor Gordon as it relates to India.

In the discussion following the samplers, the following suggestions were made about how to improve the effectiveness of Core Studies 9.

1. Core Studies 4 should be modified to include material on European colonialism to help put Core Studies 9 in historical and thematic context (Professor Cherry);

2. As possible topics to help integrate the three modules of the course the following were offered: the place of the developing world in the new global network (Professor Fahan); the historical movement from indigenous cultures interrupted by colonialism to the reemergence of those indigenous cultures (Professor Hurwitz); the process and theory of interpreting cultures instead of any given set of themes (Professor Farley).

The plenary session then broke up into individual workshops.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

David Arnow, Leader
Marvin Koenigsberg, Recorder

The group agreed that the study of a non-Western culture that exposes the student to a society unlike our own is valuable and a genuine part of the Core Curriculum.

All felt that the modules should be reduced from three to two and a minority of three favored a single culture be studied in depth.

The focus of the course should be on the fundamental institutions of the culture: That is the economic, political, religious-artistic and the military elements of a non-Western culture.

Generally, an emphasis on the intimate aspects of the people, in small groups and as individuals, would be the primary focus of the institutions that have been articulated above.

We briefly mentioned, but did not have the time to go into, 1) staffing problems, 2) difficulty of agreeing on the final ends of the course, 3) the backgrounds of the students (and their limitations), and 4) relationship between the historical antecedents of the culture and the impact of the forces of the modern world, i.e. colonialism, racism, industrialization.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Albert Bond, Leader
Norman L. Levin, Recorder

We recommend in the interest of fostering cross cultural understanding and a global perspective as well as easing interdisciplinary work:

1. Inclusion of cultural differences in the subject matter of other core courses, especially 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10.

2. Limit the number of themes in the Core 9 more rigorously and on an experimental basis limit the course to two cultures, per semester in a rotating way, i.e., Asian and African, African and Latin American, etc.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Naomi Bushman, Leader
Stanley Salthe, Recorder

Since course modules so short - need themes.

- short core reader as source of themes
- to be worked out together by teacher
- use as source of papers

Could decrease to 2 modules?

Possible themes:

Westernization as source of tensions
Attitudes toward nature and environment
Individual/family

Could lecturers interact during lectures?

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Nehru Cherukupalli, Leader
Donez Xiques, Recorder

Questions raised:

1) staffing -
   - logistical problems of team taught courses and the implications of staffing difficulties need to be addressed.
   - Use the campus resources both among faculty and students to enhance the class presentation.

2) We agreed that the goals of Core 9 could be reached in a class taught by a team or by an individual faculty member. However, when the course is team taught it will work best when the team is composed of volunteers and given sufficient time to prepare.

3) We agreed to reduce the content from 3 to 2 areas or possibly 1 area. This would liberate course time for a richer intellectual experience.

   Urge that the course be thematically unified within the sections, understanding that there be a variety of themes to choose from.

   We would like to discuss more fully "what" has worked well in Core 9 in the past in order to minimize problems in the present.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Margarite Fernandez-Olmos, Leader
Gary Mennitt, Recorder

Q. How best to give students a coherent experience in Core 9.

1. Perhaps limit course to 2 cultures -- but this suggestion does not elicit general agreement among group.

2. A pool of themes should be developed -- each team should be allowed to select one that they feel comfortable with.

3. Lecturers in each section should emphasize better coordination within their group.

4. Teams should meet before, during, and after their course.

5. Develop a common pool of readings that all sections could draw upon.

6. Define the course more clearly as a "comparison of cultures."

7. Strong coordination and leadership must be sought from the administration and the coordinator.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

George Fried, Leader
Nancy Hager, Recorder

1. We discussed relative merits of module based on a theme vs. module based on cultural areas and came up with the following compromise:

   Two cultural areas, five weeks devoted to two or three themes in each; followed by four weeks devoted to discussion and comparison.

2. At least one theme should focus on the culture in its own terms, one on that culture in collision with outside technology and values.

3. Recommend a reader to include definitions of culture, vocabulary, and a collection of readings or reading list for each theme.

4. Team of instructors should meet at least once prior to beginning of the term to select themes and plan the course.

5. Instructors should be candid about their own cultural perspective and draw in students in class, many of whom represent other cultures.

6. Use of literature was strongly endorsed by several members of group.

7. Student member urged early exam or other diagnostic device and making peer tutors available to Core 9 students.

Tuesday P.M.
June 7, 1988

Timothy Gura, Leader
Ray Gavin, Recorder

The study group chaired by Professor Gura makes the following recommendations regarding Core 9:

1) Core 9 should focus on two third world cultures instead of three.

2) The revised course would be taught by two instructors.

3) All students in Core 9 should have a common experience to be drawn from themes including geography-language, family-tribe values, economy, traditions, great figures (political, military, artistic), honor-justice, global influences on culture, "coming of age" in the culture and attitudes toward change.

4) Outside speakers ("natives") should be used to illustrate various aspects of the culture.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Naomi Halpern, Leader
Peter Zaneteas, Recorder

The Core Studies Committee should seriously consider a far stronger linkage between Core Studies 4 and Core Studies 9. We feel that Core Studies 4 should be providing a platform for Core Studies 9 and that it be given as closely as possible to Core Studies 9.

In addition, we feel that the Core Studies Committee should give far greater priority to the staffing of Core 9. In particular, the faculty of each team should be informed at least a semester ahead of time. In this way they will have the opportunity to define their course and further to coordinate their approaches and the selection of the themes they would cover and emphasize.

Pre "intent" of the course would be thus far better served and the "experience" of the students would be appreciably enhanced.

Tuesday, P.M.
June 7, 1988

Mary Oestereicher, Leader
Louis Asekoff, Recorder

1) There is no clear organizing principle or methodology.

2) Should there be? Yes, for each section.

3) To achieve this:
   a) thematic core -- work/family modernization
   b) structural:
      - habitat
      - resources
      - symbolic integration
      - social groups
   c) Common work or reading source book

4) More active student participation -- group projects, workbooks.

5) More continuity in team - teaching -- requiring commitment of department chairs in staffing, and administration in assigning teams (and limiting class size).

6) Feel necessary for course to compare at least 2 other cultures.

Tuesday P.M.
June 7, 1988

David Seidmann, Leader
Michael P. Barnett, Recorder

Majority view:
One instructor per section.

Deal with one or two non-U.S. cultures selected by instructor from approved set.
Incorporate approved number of themes from an approved set.
Provide students with paradigm of structure and coherence in a body of knowledge.
Develop students power of analysis.
Open students minds to different value systems.
Distinguish courses adequately from staple courses of area departments.

Particularly important to meet needs of students seeking order, structure, interconncetions, comparisons and contracts in information provided to them.

Minority view:

Arouse interest in different cultures by providing separate modules taught by different instructors without requiring attempt to show interconnections or provide coherence.
Restrict examination to separate tests at end of each module.

continued

Summary of Afternoon Plenary Session, June 7, 1988 — Martin Elsky, Plenary Recorder

Upon returning to plenary session, four designated reporters presented summaries of the discussion in their workshops, to which Professor Zaneteas, reporting for his workshop, added the following points: Core Studies 4 should be more strongly linked to Core Studies 9, and greater priority should be given to the staffing of Core Studies 9: faculty should receive one semester advance notice of their assignment to teach the course.

The discussion that followed these reports emphasized the administrative and logistical dilemmas of the course.

1. Professor Gordon stressed the difficulty of teaching sections with up to 80 students, a class size that discouraged student participation and led to low faculty morale;

2. Professor Van Solkema recounted to the participants that smaller recitation-discussion sections were a feature of the original design of the course, a feature meant to encourage student participation; recognizing a number of obstacles to these smaller sections, Professor Van Solkema agreed with the apparently general view that the course might have to be reduced to a two part module with two instructors, permitting smaller class size;

3. Professor Elsky suggested the possibility of having one instructor in smaller sections dealing with either one or two cultures; those involved in the course responded that

1. cross-cultural comparisons would be lost in a course dealing with one culture;

2. interaction among instructors would be lost in a course taught by one instructor; and

3. instructors would feel uncomfortable teaching a second culture outside their expertise.

Wednesday, A.M.
June 8, 1988
Nicholas Papayanis, History

On the morning of May 5, 1988, I attended a lecture in Core studies 8.2 (Geology); in the afternoon of the same day I also attended a laboratory section related to this course. On June 7, 1988, I reported my impressions of both classes to the Summer Faculty Seminar concerning the Core program, and then turned over my notes to the reporter for the morning session of that program. What follows is a written report of my impressions of the Geology lecture and lab section that I attended, but without the benefit of my notes.

My first day as a Geology student began with some apprehension, as I dreaded the thought of what I had anticipated would be a boring and/or difficult lecture on subject matter--science--that was never my favorite when I was a university student. That initial fear was completely dissipated when the professor of the course began his lecture by reviewing the major theories accounting for the extinction of dinosaurs. In a very engaging style, he proceeded to lay out clearly one hypothesis after another; the class, and this observer, was clearly captivated. Students in this class asked interesting and very relevant questions. The professor responded with the greatest ease and clarity. It was my impression, initial reservations about science aside, that I would come away from this experience with some very useful and even exciting information. Perhaps my imagination was sparked because of some romantic interest in dinosaurs. That plus the natural story-telling style and enthusiasm of the professor caused me to anticipate sharing this information/story with my wife that evening over dinner.

I wish I could report that I sustained this level of interest throughout the rest of the period. Alas, I did not. The discussion of dinosaurs was followed by what, to me at least, seemed a completely unrelated topic, namely those factors that account for the formation of valleys and hills on the island of Manhattan. I should hasten to add that this portion of the professor's lecture as as well prepared and as engaging as the discussion of dinosaurs. This topic, too, generated a lively set of questions from the students. Following this presentation, there was another--again, it seemed to me--shift in topics. The professor concluded this one lecture class by introducing the topic of waste management in modern times. My overall impression by the end of the class was one of slight dizziness. This had absolutely nothing to do with the individual professor, which is why I thought it important to report on his accomplished delivery, but rather with the apparent fact that a set syllabus containing a great deal of factual information simply had to be covered before the end of the period (and, I assume, before the end of the course). I reserve further editorial comment until I report on the lab session I attended later that afternoon.

The lab section that I attended happened to have been the last one that would be held before the final examination. In fact, the instructor apologized for the fact that this session would merely review the work of the entire semester rather than explore single issues in some depth. Ironically, this session proved to be extremely valuable to this observer

precisely because it reviewed an entire semester's lab program. The lab session consisted of a review of the means by which students could identify particular minerals and rocks. The instructor also collected each student's lab report on an individual semester project. My major impression of this lab session was that it had no relation to the lecture that I had attended in the morning. I presume it did have some bearing on other topics presented in the course throughout the semester. I could not help questioning, however, the value of an entire semester of lab work spent on identifying rocks and minerals. As this is an editorial comment by an historian and not a scientist, I wish to make explicit the context of this and a few other critical remarks contained in my observations.

Before I explain my own assumptions, I hasten to add that a peer review of my own department (History) and its core course would most likely yield its fair share of criticism. It is my intention here merely to open a (friendly) debate with colleagues across the disciplines, and if I ask questions or pose critiques, I do so from the perspective of a non-scientist with an open mind, ready to be enriched by the responses of my colleagues in the science.

Some of my critiques are quite implicit in the above review. Here I wish to make them explicit and to relate the hypothesis that informs them. First the hypothesis. Reading from the Introduction to the Core Curriculum, one learns in the general introduction that, by taking the Core science courses "students develop an understanding of scientific concepts and methods and, gradually, a sense of the role of the sciences in modern life." Moreover, it is the purpose of all core courses to cultivate "the intellect and imagination" and to develop "general mental skills rather than vocational skills." Finally, "Quality of exposure rather than breadth of coverage is the most important factor in Core courses." (p. 6) Reading from the introduction to the Core sciences, one also learns that these courses are courses "in science, not about science." (p. 14; emphasis in original). At the same time, these courses should acquaint students "with the vistas of modern science and a critical appreciation of the way in which knowledge of nature and the individual is gained." (p. 14). This then is the overall project relating to the science core.

As a historian I am doubly aware that the single case study--in this case one lecture and one lab section--has to be used very cautiously before arriving at general conclusions. With this reservation in mind, I turn now (foolishly perhaps) to some initial conclusions based upon my experience. The lecture that I attended certainly did conform in part to the general aims of the core courses. Broad hypotheses were offered to explain some very fundamental geological phenomena. However, there was also a resolute attempt on the part of the professor to cover a certain amount of factual knowledge. I could not help wondering whether the geology department, despite its aim to focus on plate tectonics, and thereby illuminate not only a certain focused subject matter but also the manner in which a geologist operates, does not undercut its own project by also attempting too broad a coverage of the subject matter. This did cause me to question whether and to what extend the lecture I attended

was basically part of a standard geology course, albeit in shortened form.

There is also a broader and somewhat related question here, which I simply raise for the purpose of discussion. If the aim of the science courses is as broad as the Core program suggests it is, does it really matter which specific science component a student completes? This is to say, if the aid of Core science is to teach the student something about the scientific method and mode of discourse, does it really matter which of the basic natural or life sciences is taught in the core program? For that matter, would not a course outside one of the "basic four" of chemistry, physics, biology or geology--meteorology or oceanography, for example--serve the project of teaching something about the nature of scientific method and discourse just as well? While this last suggestion is offered only half seriously, it also serves to illustrate a serious point. I cannot help wondering whether there are really two conflicting goals in the Core sciences, and that this may account for my slight uneasiness in the geology lecture. I wonder whether the Geology Department is trying to offer traditional coverage while at the same time covering the broad principles of the core program? To the extent that this is the project, and to the extent that it must be completed within the space of a half semester, is could cause severe problems in the teaching of the Core sciences.

The lab section I attended had obviously trained students in a methodology geologists employ to identify minerals and rocks, but amounted to nothing more than the identification of those rocks and minerals. My question in this regard was whether the apparent aim of this lab, namely a hands-on experience in the manner of a geologist, could not have been reduced to one or two sessions, covering a few classic examples, and whether there could be a greater relationship between the lab and the classroom experience.

I appreciate the very friendly and collegial manner in which my colleagues in the geology department received my report at the Faculty Seminar, and look forward to the exchange of ideas that our seminar program has engendered.

June 8, a.m.

Bruce MacIntyre, Conservatory of Music

Before I begin, let me say that until last month I had never attended a college chemistry course. I only took the one year of high-school chemistry required by the Regents of the State of New York some 22 or 23 years ago! In college I took mathematics and physics as my science components.

On Monday morning, May 2, 1988 I observed a lecture (Prof. Pizer) and a laboratory (Mr. Xu) for Core Studies 7.1, i.e. the Chemistry module which was nearing the end of its seven-week duration. Normally students in Core 7.1 attend two such hour-and-a-half lectures plus one two-hour lab per week.

First, about the lecture. The lecture was an exciting one, delivered with great gusto and chock full of subjects to which the students could relate. The topics included organic chemistry, carbon compounds, condensation reactions, polymers, esters, tri-glycerides, saturated and unsaturated fats, hydrocarbons, amino acids, and nitrogen fixation. All these subjects were related to everyday phenomena such as cholesterol, pollution, soap, cell membranes, body metabolism, vitamins & minerals, protein, the atmosphere, the ozone layer, and wine. These subjects, as you may note, also tie in with other sciences such as biology.

I attended a two-hour lab that immediately followed the lecture. This was the sixth and last lab for these Core 7.1 students. After a 10-minute introduction by the instructor, the sixteen or so students on hand proceeded to build various molecular models from little black, red, white, green, and blue balls that represented carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, and nitrogen atoms. Students followed neatly organized lab sheets that described what molecules they were to build from these "Tinker Toys" and were asked to answer pertinent questions in writing. There were some connection to the lecture just attended; for example, the students had to build parts of hydrocarbons and macromolecules or polymers. Most of the students completed the lab within one hour. A lab technician then circulated among the students to make sure that they were returning all lab equipment assigned to them for the seven weeks.

Afterwards I asked myself the following several questions, to which I shall give my brief replies:

Was the lecture good for a liberal arts student?

Yes and no. Certainly I observed a model teacher who was conveying his excitement about a multitude of topics--in fact too many topics for one 75-minute class. The topics were definitely relevant to today's living, but there were just too many--at least for the ears of this non-scientist. I especially liked how the professor ended his talk with a particular "problem" that the next lecture would undoubtedly "solve." Such "cliff hangers" certainly can enliven the teaching of science.

Do the students learn new things from the lecture?

Certainly yes, but perhaps too many new things. On the other hand, I would be a bit surprised if many year-long high school chemistry courses do not teach many of the topics I heard about. One student showed me her tests thus far in Core 7.1, and I was amazed at the relative simplicity of the questions asked. In other words, the students are apparently not tested on the multitude of details that seemed a bit "overwhelming" to me in the lecture. The tests seem to stick to the basics of chemistry and its processes, requiring a minimum of complicated formula memorization.

How did the students respond to the lecture?

The students seemed as apathetic as any can be for 8:35 in the morning. The teacher's questions always seemed to be answered by the same handful of attentive, interested students. Many students seemed passive, uninterested in the quite inspiring lecture. During the first part of the lecture, which reviewed a large chunk of organic chemistry, numerous formulae were written very quickly on the board. Most students were so busy frantically copying down the many numbers and letters that I'm not so sure they had ample time to truly listen and think about what they were hearing. I felt their eyes and fingers were busier than their minds. Of course, I did not witness earlier lectures or see what they had been reading, but I felt the pace was a bit too rapid for non-chemistry majors. I assume that the students had adequately reviewed the periodic table and chemical shorthand during the earlier weeks in the semester.

In addition to the fast pace, the various new technical terms such as disruptive distillation, esters, polymers, glycerol, tri-glycerides, double bond, testosterone, polar & non-polar molecules, ionic molecules, amines, valence, glycine, thermosphere, mesosphere, stratosphere, troposphere, nitrogen fixation, etc. --- all these strange words led to "glazed eyes" for some of the less interested students.

How did the students respond to the lab?

The lab--simplistic as this one was--seemed to be a real bore for the students I observed. Talking to a couple of the students, I received the impression that the labs were kind of a "waste of time" for them. I think a stronger linkage with the lecture might help. Perhaps the lectures should "build up" a little more directly to the lab subject of the week. Do the same teachers ever do both the lectures and and the labs for the same students? That might help.

Summary

To sum up, I found Core 7.1 to be a very stimulating science course for students who have a curious, scientific bent and who are good with formulae. However, for a seven-week course it seems to cover too much territory, expecting students to absorb exciting but complicated processes, vocabulary, and formulae in too short a time frame. The subject matter is important for every living being, but many topics should be and perhaps have been covered in previous chemistry courses taken in high school. Nonetheless Core Studies 7.1 remains a valid course option for liberal arts students not majoring in science.

June 8, A.M.
Manuel Martinez-Pons, Education

Following are my observations regarding the 1988 core curriculum workshop. It consists of three parts: Lecture/lab Attendance, Workshop Attendance and Recommendations.

Lecture/Lab Attendance

In preparation for the workshop, I attended a lecture and lab session for the same course in Physics. The lecture concerned the topic of Light (historical background, general properties, the wave theory of light and the quantum theory of light). The session was an exciting one. The students were responsive and seemed interested in the information being conveyed. The instructor in turn was responsive to the students' concerns and was able to maintain direction while attending to tangential issue raised by participants.

The lab consisted entirely of "hands-on" practice in the measurement of radioactivity levels. The lab instructor was a graduate student. In contrast to the lecture, the lab session seemed fraught with problems. First, the instructor, who was foreign, while very enthusiastic and obviously knowledgeable about the topic, seemed to have difficulty using the English language. This condition made it difficult for the students to understand the conceptual frame of reference being presented, or to follow directions for carrying out the measurement tasks. In addition, the equipment was faulty: several of the measuring instruments broke down during the session, causing interruptions while the affected students found others with whom they could share the equipment. The net result of these two conditions was that after several minutes into the session, the students began to display frustration and boredom by talking among themselves, walking around the laboratory and leaving the room for several minutes at a time.

Workshop Attendance

I had the pleasure of attending the 1987 Core workshop as well as this year's workshop. A major difference between the two meetings was that, for 1988, representatives from the various departments offering core courses tended to serve as moderators for the group sessions. While this practice in 1988 may have seemed like a good idea at first, I noticed that the moderators tended to become somewhat defensive when criticism of any aspect of the core was offered. In addition, the moderators for the group session in which I participated tended to maintain too tight a control over the proceedings; in one case, the mediator demanded adherence to Robert's Rule of Order. The net result of these two tendencies was that the exchange of ideas, good or bad, did not seem as free-flowing or exciting as last year's. This was especially unfortunate in cases where brainstorming would have been useful for addressing the issues at hand.

I noticed during the demonstrations and discussion of courses that while the subject matter being taught was described in detail, little was said concerning modern issues surrounding the science of learning and instruction. Topics from the field of Educational Psychology like affective, cognitive and psychomotor taxonomies of instructional objectives; task analysis; testing theory; computer utilization in individualized instruction and assessment of readiness levels were never mentioned. Yet, they involve matters that must be systematically addressed if innovative programs such as the core curriculum are to be successful. So I was left with question: Are effective and efficient methods of instruction being used consistently in the design and execution of the courses?

Finally, the inclusion this year of participants from other institutions, as well as of student peer tutors from the core was a good idea. The perspectives brought by them to the group sessions nicely complemented those of the BC faculty.

Recommendations

In closing, I would like to make the following recommendations:

1. Insure that lectures and laboratory workshops for the same courses are completely coordinated, so that the lectures serve as conceptual frames of reference for the lab activities, and the labs in turn become natural continuations of the lecture sessions.

2. If graduate students are to be used in the lab sessions, insure that they have sufficient mastery of the language to communicate effectively with the students.

3. Insure that laboratory equipment works before the beginning of lab sessions.

4. Attempt to employ consultants from the field of Educational Psychology in the further development and evaluation of the core courses. Great strides have been made in this field during the past several years, and the methods and procedures offered by this rigorous discipline should be tapped and exploited as the core curriculum continues to evolve. The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY, has nationally known individuals who could be of great service in this respect.

Wednesday, A.M.
June 8, 1988

Thomas Mermall, Recorder

Non-Scientists' views of Core 7 & 8

Although the quality of instruction in the science courses was fully recognized the observers pointed out the following shortcomings: The materials presented in Geology and Chemistry were excessive and poorly coordinated with lab work. To quote the colleague who evaluated the Chemistry course, "For a seven week course it seems to cover too much territory, expecting students to absorb exciting but complicated processes, vocabulary and formulae in too short a time." Another colleague thought the course in Geology did not enhance, through its lab, the stated goals of the Core description: "to develop an understanding of scientific concepts and methods." The verdict on Physics also faults poor coordination of lecture with lab and misses a clear definition of the place of science in the larger contexts of intellectual inquiry. Both observers suggested that instructors be more specific in their lab experiments as to the method or principle of scientific inquiry that is being demonstrated.

A colleague reporting on Biology found the students too distracted to absorb the import of the lectures and noted the disparity in their preparation. Who is our audience and how should we structure our lectures, she wondered.

The student participants were unanimous in condemning the use of multiple choice exams.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

William Beer, Leader and Recorder

1. The Columbia model is attractive, but inappropriate for us, for several reasons:

   a) it is not a required course, as our Core 7 and 8 are
   b) it uses team teachers and teaching assistants, so is inapplicable for budgetary reasons
   c) it is a year-long course, which we cannot use

2. The theme approach explained by Schwartz is already used within segments of Core 7 and 8. There is already an implicit order-of-magnitude approach, as in atomic/chemistry - molecular and cellular/biology - earth/geology - space/physics, with physics looping back to the atomic and subatomic levels too. Perhaps this already implicit order-of-magnitude approach should be made more explicit.

3. Carefully reconsider existing labs, eliminate some, (perhaps get faculty more involved in teaching them.)

4. Don't change tier structure but allow some freshmen to take Core 7 and 8 out of sequence.

5. Reduce scope of each segment and give professors some more latitude in deciding what to offer.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Wendy Fairey, Leader
Jerry Megna, Recorder

1) Roger Blumberg's description of the "Columbia U Model" would not work at Brooklyn College as part of the Core curriculum, but might be valuable as a second Science course outside the Core.

2) Professor Blumberg agreed that the reason the Columbia model works has less to do with the quality of the students Columbia gets than the fact that the course engages students with subject matter in a different way: lecture approach is not emphasized; dialogue among students and teachers is encouraged; minimal additional material is introduced.

3) Depth in a topic rather than scope in content ought to be the operating principle of a curriculum for Core 7 and 8.

4) There ought to be a reconceptualization of the existing Science Core. We should permit alternative versions to better release the energy of the faculty.

1) Retain present set of courses as one possible versions for science faculty who like this way.

2) Possibly a few sections based on the Columbia Model.

3) Develop the thematic approach "time, fire" models, as outlined by Brian Schwartz.

(But no more than 2 or 3 options to retain manageability, etc.)

5) Adopt a "theme approach" to the Science Core so that each of the Science Departments picks a chunk of the theme, develops the curriculum and teaches it. The people who develop the curriculum will pick the theme.

6) Require a science instructor to teach a Core Science course which includes at least one topic out of his major discipline. (Eg: Biology and Chemistry taught by one instructor).

7) Freshmen can take Science Core during their first tier.

8) Instructors who teach lecture should also teach lab. There is too much of a lack of integration and coordination between the lecture and lab in the present Science Core. A study should be undertaken to use grad assistants more efficiently in the Sciences.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Vincent Fuccillo, Leader
Ruth Kleinman, Recorder & Reporter

Current structure seems to be sound, but should not preclude possible experimentation (i.e. shorter version of Columbia course). Classes are too large, for economic reasons to have anything other than lectures. Labs have validity for hands-on experience and for active problem-solving. TA's should not be used. There was some sentiment that some lab sessions might be used for discussion.

Wednesday p.m.
June 8, 1988

Nancy Hager, Leader
Michael Kahan, Recorder

Three possible organizing ideas:

1) Topical (not Thematic: The difference being that a single topic is explored in vertical depth from the point of view of the specific discipline) e.g.: AIDS
SDI
Nuclear War

2) Combine the four sciences into 2-4 credit courses and let the department work out the details:

   a. Chemistry & Biology
   b. Physics & Geology

3) 2 Semesters:

   a. a general introduction to scientific thought & history & method

   b. a one-semester lecture - lab course in any one of the sciences

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Philip Gallagher, Leader
Bettie M. Smolansky, Recorder

If commonality and coherence are the objectives, our workshop group has failed; we achieved no consensus on any of the assigned tasks.

We spent some time getting an update on changes in the science courses that will begin in the Fall. (The 14 week, two-credit courses replacing the seven week modules, etc.). We also talked about the morning presentations (Columbia's case-study, primary source-based model and Dr. Schwartz's thematic approach).

While all thought both had great appeal, the feeling was that the Columbia model would flounder here on a logistical basis (class size, range of student ability/motivation, etc.) Most of us also felt that scope/coverage should not be the engine which drives the science core; however, there was substantial sentiment that some scientific facts have an intrinsic importance for anyone trying to live in modern society. That is, there is something called scientific literacy though we might have trouble agreeing defining what it is in specific terms.

There was a division in our group about whether laboratory experience is a necessity and that discussion led to one of our most interesting insights: to wit, while there is lip service to a shared paradigm called "the scientific method," the sciences use it differently. Specifically, it appears that physics and chemistry (lab sciences) comprise one distinctive subset of the scientific disciplines and biology and geology (with their emphasis on field-based experiments) are another.

Therefore, the suggestion was made that we might give students the option of selecting one of each of these two pairs of disciplines for more in-depth study, perhaps thematically based and preferably allowing for some professorial autonomy in executing these themes. (There is also an implicit assumption that laboratory periods might be used for a broader range of problem-solving experiences than traditional laboratory experiments, especially in biology and geology.)

On a more practical level, there was consensus that regulations or strategies need it be devised to discourage the current wide-spread practice of students postponing the fulfillment of the Core 7 and 8 requirement until late in their undergraduate careers.

Finally, this reporter, as one of your Summer Associates and thus "an outsider," cannot resist the temptation to offer a summary personal observation: insofar as the members of our discussion group adequately represent the Brooklyn College faculty, the major underlying problem in the design/execution of the science core is the lack of a real consensus among you about how and in what sense your graduates should become scientifically literate.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

James Levine, Leader
Louis Asekoff, Recorder

The science modules should not try to offer broad coverage or surveys of a field; they should be limited in scope and focus on a specific topic or set of topics within a field. While this topic or set of topics would be determined by the individual instructor, each module should make the students aware that science is historical, and that it is a way of thinking about (and acting in) the world. Some issues raised might be: How is scientific knowledge acquired and validated? What is the nature of scientific theories? How does science change?

The "labs" should be replaced with relevant "activities" designed by the individual instructors of each module. The activities may include group projects, demonstrations, field-trips, reading of primary papers, sharing of original research, hands-on experience of materials.

Wednesday P.M.
June 8, 1988

Charlton M. Lewis, Leader
Lionel Bier, Recorder

Students should come away with a working understanding of scientific method, laws and theories. Specific materials should be chosen by individual instructor or department. But the course should be essentially a science course with all other goals such as practical applications to everyday life secondary.

The laboratory component is central and should be given more time so that ideas can be developed and followed through without haste (and frustration). We recommend 3 hours laboratory to every hour of recitation.

Lab experiments might concentrate on establishing simple laws and patterns of laws like linear dependence. The four sciences could be integrated by a thematic approach. For example, "properties of materials":

1. covers all four branches of science

2. can be related to the world around us

3. is the subject of numerous scientific laws and theories

This approach might make it easier to limit scope and coverage of the science component of core.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Emily Michael, Leader
Tucker Farley, Recorder

- To address problems of lab-lecture structure over broad scope of "teaching a field" with "too many details," and student alienation.

- Reveals function on principle of less is more for the student.

- The papers approach: discovery of the conditions and methods of science thinking, questioning, in a community, with specific instruments and theories, that change over time.

To incorporate different teaching methods with strengths representing the goal for students to see how we know what we know and how we "discover" the discourse of "the scientific method" and representing the philosophy of the core, we proposed a combination:

> Have the sciences develop a core list of themes for each module. Use the lab to explore series of papers a la Columbia approach. Suggest development of projects where students could write papers and/or work in small groups and perhaps even move beyond the classrooms, providing a basis of performance for evaluation of students.

Benefits: teach way of thinking, function in scientific mode, involve students, realistically address availability of institutional resources and academic training.

Note for planning: aim for the "poetry" and "aesthetics" of science.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Robert Muccigrosso, Leader
Thomas Mermall, Recorder

1. Instructors should develop a more conceptual approach in their teaching to supplement that quantitative and formulaic content of their subject. The principles and methods of scientific inquiry should be stressed.

2. Laboratory models should be re-structured according to the goals of the course.

3. Instructors should be granted more flexibility in presenting their subject as long as they remain within the general guidelines of the course.

4. A "core honors" course would be welcomed as an alternative for gifted students.

5. An interdisciplinary approach to modules such as bio-chemistry was recommended.

6. We should explore the possibility of linking Core 5 with Core 7 and 8 to strengthen preparation in mathematics necessary for an understanding of the sciences.

Wednesday, P.M.
June 8, 1988

Donez Xiques, Leader
Gary Mennitt, Recorder

1. Provide lecturers with some freedom of choice in deciding what to cover and depth of coverage as is being done now in Core 5.

2. Encourage some team-teaching sections, i.e., combine physics and chemistry, or biology and chemistry, or geology and physics.

3. If some labs are pointless, be realistic and do without them, i.e., focus on what works well.

4. One member particularly wanted

   a) increased level of mathematics - don't be intimidated by students <u>apparent</u> lack of ability.

   b) ensure correlation between lecture and laboratory.

   c) encourage more discourse and not an overemphasis on lecture.

   d) goal should be that students can read relevant literature at end of course.

The main discussion centered around the topic of keeping or not keeping the science labs. Vojtech Fried was one of the many who strongly wished to keep the labs. He made his most telling point with the comment "any science without a lab is like a man without a heart."

The sticks and balls models used in some labs came under attack by a number of faculty, nevertheless, other science faculty defended these models on the grounds that they gave a 3-D representation which was not possible in any other way.

A member of the Physics Department (Norma Eisen) stated that next year the Physics labs for each course would be under the direct supervision of the lecturer. It was also stated that no common exams would be given. This will allow each instructor a certain amount of flexibility in teaching his own lectures. Finally, graduate students will not be used in Physics labs.

The Chemistry, Biology and Geology Departments held onto their present position that graduate students have to be used in their labs for a number of reasons. The Geology Department also defended their rock identification labs as necessary and useful in conducting their Core course.

The consensus seemed to be that the useful labs should be kept but that pointless labs ought to be dropped or improved to bring about a better student experience.

One good suggestion related to a unification of the science Core. The suggestion was made by Evan Williams that Jacob Bronowski's book "Ascent of Man" could be used since it deals with topics in all sciences. Another faculty member mentioned that a viewing of the video tapes of the "Ascent of Man" series on PBS would be an extremely useful way to cover the material from the book.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1968

David Arnow, Leader
Norma Eisen, Recorder

Core Studies 2.2

Text in course is the music and can only be experienced aurally.

Goals: 1) to learn to listen and appreciate.

2) to inter-relate music to other courses in the Core.

Writing/Verbal articulation necessary to achieve skills and should raise understanding to level of consciousness and improve thinking.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Albert Bond, Leader
Leslie Jacobson, Recorder

Core Studies 2.2: Introduction to Music

Goals of course - increased perception and sensitivity, listening skills, intellectual as well as visceral interactions breadth - classical, western, some non-western and jazz.

- consensus that writing is an essential skill which complements everything we do, it informs, it forces the students to be precise in their analysis, their organizational skills. It is an integral part of their thinking.

- should also be able to describe their feelings. Therefore, students with poor writing skills should not automatically be assigned to music core as they often are.

- writing assignments should be more challenging than they are now - not merely descriptions of concerts: it was suggested that students could be asked to analyse a (new piece of music) unfamiliar piece.

- in 2.2 as in the other core courses, less is more. Too much material to cover (8 areas at present). Need more time for verbal interaction.

- skills you want students to come away with: to talk intelligently about a piece of music; to read a N.Y. Times music review critically; to write with precision about a piece of music; to make contextual connections; to have some knowledge of the vocabulary of music and of the history of music and background to read program notes intelligently; to make connections between music and the rest of thier lives -- e.g., religion, social connections, culture, life passages.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Naomi Bushman, Leader
Hyman Sardy, Recorder

Core 9 can be an excellent capstone course.

The need to integrate the conceptual skills of Tier I into our understanding of culture.

The skills of the anthropologists must be utilized in our understanding of the abstractions and generality of culture.

While we felt the need to emphasize writing across-the-curriculum we felt it should not be used as a fetish to the exclusion of other alternatives such as music, quantification, etc.

Representing thoughts symbolically has power that can be used in discourse to better understand culture.

A better and more effective way to utilize the skills of Tier I exist in

a. simulation with computers
b. quantification with statistics
c. understanding truth, proof, verification, etc., and their use in the rhetoric of culture

Writing across-the-curriculum should be used to demand the precision of the vocabulary developed in the various disciplines of Tier I. Writing can be used to share experience in order to assist in the richness of rhetoric and argument in understanding the macro-components of culture.

- It was suggested that a student write about A&S Department store as a Nigerian might see it or they might write reactions to a slide.

Use of the laboratory in the sense of filed trips can enrich knowledge of culture. Visit to several botanical gardens as an example.

Because this will take additional time the plethora of facts ought to be much diminished with the ultimate result that the facts fall into a context that involves a conceptual framework of some diversity.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Nehru E. Cherukupalli, Leader
Marion Himes, Recorder

Core Studies 5

Is a writing component necessary in Core 5?

The answer is yes but this component is defined as writing a program.

Programs and, if possible, a mathematical proof or solving a small problem in mathematics should be the result of the course.

Students should be able to make flow sheets.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Margarite Fernandez-Olmos, Leader
Mark Fishman, Recorder

1) The writing skills necessary in the sciences are essentially not different from those in any other discipline.

   a. Skills in the sciences to be taught:
      - to observe
      - to critically think about observed world
      - to test ones thinking and to come to a conclusion
      - to express the conclusion--this is where writing comes in

2) Should Core sciences teach the communication skills required of scientists? Probably.

   a. Writing is a necessary tool for learning.
      - to express conclusions
      - to intensify thinking
      - to refine thinking

3) How to use writing in Cores 7, 8:

   a. Writing assignments
      1) for each lab there should be a written lab report that:
         a) asks students exactly what they did and what they learned
         b) is graded (and may have to go through more than one draft)
   b. Give essay exams, not multiple choice tests.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

George H. Fried, Leader
Charles Godino, Recorder

1) Turn over some of the labs to oral presentations by students on assigned controversial topics.

2) Lead discussions in the lab with the end result that students will read articles on contemporary Biology such as genetic engineering, pollution control, surrogate motherhood (see also Core 10).

3) The plus and minus of new discoveries in modern science on society -- written assignments.

4) Mandate that Chemistry 7.1 be taken along with or before Biology 8.1. This would help Biology and Geology to assign writing assignments -- to cross boundary lines such as between Chemistry and Biology.

5) Minority opinion -- End of term project or paper on a topic which involves Biology and at least one of the other sciences.

6) End result -- Student should develop a life-long skill enabling them to read things like the Science Times; and other popular science magazines with some degree of understanding.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Timothy Gura, Leader
Phyllis Bigel, Recorder

Core 7-8

General discussion by the group was followed by specific suggestions.

Skills appropriate for this course

1) Students should demonstrate that they understand the assumptions of science in Core 7 and 8.

2) Students should demonstrate that they have learned to observe intelligently and understand natural phenomena

3) Students should demonstrate their understanding of what they hear because language is different from language in other courses.

Writing would be utilized in attaining these skills.

Product

1) Essay questions be utilized for part of the examinations given in these courses.

2) Primary sources should be utilized with specific assignments challenging to the students. (not just summaries)

3) Use of written laboratory reports

4) Use of written reports after lectures to demonstrate understanding of student

One member of the committee subsequently submitted the following questions as examples of essay questions that could be employed in science courses

Sample writing assignment

Take an article showing the historical process, among scientists, of how a particular phenomenon was discovered. Mumps, for example. At different points, scientists and practitioners were able to observe differently, especially before and after the microscope.

a) Have half the students write what the disease "is" before the microscope and half write what it "is" after.

b) Have students analyze the process the community of scientists and practitioners went through to come to the point where a doctor treats
mumps.

c) Describe what is agreed upon and what are areas of dispute still being problematic.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Noemi Halpern, Leader
Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio

Core 2.1

Professor Bier, who teaches 2.1, suggested that the skills aimed for in the course are: how to look at, how to see (understand), and how to analyze works of art -- that is, how a work of art projects a picture of the world and how that might be analyzed. It was agreed that analysis in this heavily populated course is most easily done via writing.

Thursday, A.M.
June 9, 1988

Robert Muccigrosso, Leader
David Walters, Recorder

Our group task was to clearly define and identify those skills we thought appropriate for Core Studies 9. As a result of our groups deliberation we agree upon the following:

1) All written work should express the precise feeling of the issues presented in class assignments.

2) A systematic attempt should be made to make students analyze cultures other than their own.

3) Students should be taught geographic and demographic skills.

4) Students should be taught the economic transformation of various cultures.

The classroom techniques and assignments the group recommended for the course are as follows:

1) Require map reading for all the students in the course (map of the countries been studied during the term).

2 Have students research a small aspect of a culture not studied in class and make class presentations.

3 Have students gain empathy of other cultures through writing, reading and role playing as a member of a culture other than the student's own culture.

Thurdsay, A.M.
June 9, 1988

David Seidemann, Leader
Elizabeth Weis, Recorder

REPORT ON WRITING IN CORE 2.1

General Principle:

The group strongly condemned the all-inclusive approach to art history. It was felt that limiting the course to the comparison of the works of two or three eras or two cultures would provide a more valuable experience.

Skills and Goals:

1. Understand a work of art in itself.

2. Understand a work of art in its historical and cultural context.

3. Have the vocabulary and abilities to interpret and evaluate a work of art.

4. Broaden the students' minds to excite them to want to look at art on their own.

Writing assignments would promote the goals of 1,3, and 4 above.

Classroom activities and assignments:

1. Comparing of works of art from two cultures would be particularly important in complementing the goals of Core Nine.

2. To personalize the creative process it might prove valuable to invite presentations from studio artists in the Art Department.

3. Some assignments should encourage students to go out into the community and take advantage of the city's rich cultural offerings, such as its architecture and museums.

To help students observe more carefully what they see on excursion, assignments might include:

1. Photographs or sketches

2. Writing assignments based on the excursions that encourage the students to observe, evaluate and refine their vocabulary on aesthetic issues.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

William Beer, Leader
Tony Nadal, Recorder

Liberal education and how core can enhance it

Requiring a minor -- one that is structured in breadth and scope.

- "Scientists" are encouraged to venture into other areas of the liberal arts. But non-science majors do not seem to be encouraged to take post-core sciences courses.

Physics has post-core courses. Other science departments ought to follow the example of Physics.

The Blumberg or Schwartz models might fit well in a post-core setting.

For example: a "Great Papers in Biology" as a post-core Science course.

Special Topics rubrics should be used.

- The advisement (counseling) system should not encourage academic parochialism.
- Abolish vocational majors at Brooklyn College. (See distinction between vocations and professions.)
- The optional "P" grade in semester of 96th credit.

Advise in bulletin that up to 6 courses may be taken on P-F option from sophomore year on. This could encourage choice of free electives in departments outside majors.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Wendy Fairey, Leader
Victor Franco, Recorder

Barriers:

1. Value that world (culture, society) places on life-long learning and on a liberal education.

2. Essentially no academic dialogue going on on campus, either between students and faculty or among faculty themselves.

Recommend:

1. Deepen the Core. Create third and forth tier. Allow it to be optional (need not be taken). Make it interdisciplinary.

2. Create options in Core courses. Particularly for faculty. Faculty should be allowed to teach outside their areas (assuming some expertise in the area).

3. Need resources to sponsor conferences, symposia, workshops for faculty development. There should be two foci:

    1. Teach faculty to make classroom more student-centered.
    2. Teach faculty to make writing assignments that are geared to making writing a tool for learning.

4. Stress the importance of articulating to the college community the importance of liberal education.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Vincent Fuccillo, Leader
Nicholas Papayanis, Recorder

General Comments

1. The Core does not have to generate interest in further study in areas of Core -- because Core in itself is a worth while experience. (This does not imply Core is a perfect product.)

2. The majority had no problem with the Core being spaced out over several years because this majority believed the Core itself was the final product. A minority of one on the committee believed that the Core should be a requirement for all electives.

Barriers and Product

1. The reading and writing exams for entrance to the Core do not seem adequate to the kind of work done in many (if not most) of the Core courses. Some very basic skills in reading and writing are lacking -- and this issue must be addressed.

As there is a higher "reading pass" for B.C. there should also be a higher "writing pass."

2. Greater amount of commonality in approach and content of material and across the Core.

There was greater disagreement on this point, especially the part on common material.

3. Perhaps there might be a set of interdisciplinary courses that come out of the Core program.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Philip Gallagher, Leader
Peter Zaneteas, Recorder

We feel that there are two serious impediments that inhibit the Core from becoming the starting point of life-long learning.

1. Very frequently the scope and the extent of the academic course is so extensive and ambitious that very little time is left to show relevance and relation to other events.

2. Extensive professionalism of certain majors narrows and therefore prevents the extension of the Core into a wider Liberal Arts education.

At the same time one feels that there are certain steps that can be taken that would significantly broaden and expand the Core experience.

1. If the courses could be linked in content and significance then this linkage would develop into a ladder of higher understanding. We are aware, however, that this presents serious academic and logistical problems.

2. Students should be encouraged to experiment with courses from disciplines other than their chosen major for the noble purpose of broadening their horizon and enhancing their understanding.

3. Institute College-wide experimentation with special academic programs and classes which would expand and tap the Core experience.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Nancy Hager, Leader
Robert Cherry, Recorder

1. General analytical and expository skills should be seen as a successful outcome of the Core. They texture to other disciplines so that they enhance understanding in non-Core preprofessional areas.

2. Students are fearful of going on to demanding second courses which will be dominated by majors and involve risk in the G.P.A. department they hesitate to choose non-major electives.

Departments should consider identifying a few selected topical courses geared to non-majors to provide an opportunity for students in less threatening manner.

3. We all thought that students should be required to take either an established minor or an individually developed coherent four (or five) course grouping.

4. Faculty should take seriously engaging students in non course activities--films, lectures, etc., as a means of building on Core experience.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

James Levine, Leader
Raymond Gittings, Recorder

Workshop on "A Liberal Arts Core as Starting Point or Terminus"

The workshop began with a discussion of how the Core serves as a starting point for life-long learning. Some of the ways the Core accomplishes this or should accomplish this are noted below:

1. Give students a broad education while introducing them to various disciplines.

2. Should promote understanding of connections between disciplines and on relationships between various periods of civilization and different cultures.

3. Students should appreciate how civilization and science have changed over time.

4. In order to instill in students an appreciation for life-long learning, the Core needs to teach students to be curious, to develop an appreciation and awareness of knowledge, to stress the importance of reading. Students need to learn how to learn and learn how to think and do on their own and to leave the Core with a desire to continue to educate themselves.

5. As a starting point for a liberal arts education, it is important that Tier I course develop maturity and that the courses be rigorous enough to serve as a transition from high school level work to college level work.

The group did not discuss specific barriers or possible solutions. However, it was noted that we need to face the fact that many students view the Core itself as a hurdle (barrier) to what they perceive to be their educational goals. It is only after the Core is completed that many students appreciate its importance and significance. What they get out of a specific Core course is sometimes the result of a great teacher rather than actual content.

The workgroup makes the following three suggestions for change that might enhance the Core's ability to serve as a starting point for life-long learning.

1. We should loosen the course requirements to emphasize common goals rather than common facts. It is important to focus on what students will take away from each individual Core course. The diversity among teachers is one of greatest strengths and we should not tie their hands with an overemphasis on course content and by stressing the need to cover a common collection of facts. Core courses should not be prerequisites for courses in the major.

2. Teaching techniques and topics in Core courses should generate student participation, student involvement and critical thinking. The large class size in Core courses makes this a difficult goal.

3. Since many incoming students are not prepared to begin the Core curriculum in their freshmen year it is recommended that a task force be formed for the purpose of studying "The Freshmen Year for Underprepared Students."

Since this was the last session of the Faculty Development Seminar, we should stress the importance of continuing the fruits of the seminar throughout the year. We should encourage further visits to Core classes by faculty from other departments and encourage other means of faculty interaction on the Core Curriculum.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Charlton M. Lewis, Leader
Jules Gelernt, Recorder

The workshop's views are based on the assumptions that "there is life after the Core." To enable students to follow some interest that may have been generated in a Core course, certain broad recommendations follow:

1. The requirement that the Core be completed within the first 96 credits be enforced;

2. That a reasonable cap be set on the requirements for the major, and that the appropriate committee of Faculty Council be asked to bring to Faculty Council a concrete proposal for action;

3. That a small number of courses belong outside the major and its collective requirements be regarded as electives; and that, again, the appropriate committee of Faculty Council bring forward a specific proposal;

4. That the problems related to transfer students be studied in detail with a view to avoiding crippling penalties by virtue of transferring to the college.

5. Lastly, that Core departments identify follow-up courses for students who wish to go on to one additional course in the field.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Emily Michael, Leader
David Leveson, Recorder

1. The taking of more advanced courses in the same field as a Core course is not a valid measure of the success of the Core.

2. It would be a good idea to develop courses designed for non-majors that have as their only prerequisite an appropriate Core course.

3. Develop courses that students can take outside their major areas that have no prerequisites. Thus, Freshmen, etc., can take these courses. Courses described in (2) and (3) should be well advertised.

4. If core courses were less "discipline-bound" they might better foster intellectual explanation.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Mary Oestereicher, Leader
Evan Williams, Recorder

Core isn't enough. It must be a starting point.

If one hasn't decided upon a major or course of study one might take more Core courses early. Students who enter with a major in mind may not finish the Core till their senior year.

Take some courses out of second Tier if they aren't taught with the original second Tier philosophy in mind.

Suggestion 1: Strengthen articulation between pre-Core courses and Core courses. Problem of underprepared students in Core 5.

Task -- sort of obvious. It seems to be working-out.

Students don't necessarily demonstrate the effectiveness of the Core by taking electives. Not much chance in the sciences and mathematics.

High-credit majors make it difficult for students to take electives which build on the Core.

Suggestion 2: Emphasize the idea of "capstone" courses, pulling things together (Core 6, 9, 10.)

Suggestion 3: Encourage and strengthen cross-connections between Core courses.

Disagreement here -- some say we should not have "capstone" courses, perhaps not even Tiers.

Suggestion 4: Better enforcement of completion of Tier 1 by 48 credits, Tier 2 by 96 credits.

Suggestion 5: Provide a list of suggested courses to follow any of the main subjects covered in the Core or subjects not covered specifically in the Core -- such as ethics, religion. Institute a senior seminar.

Thursday, P.M.
June 9, 1988

Donez Xiques, Leader
Edward Kent, Recorder

Ways to enhance liberal learning in Core

1. Students should be engaged in self-motivated learning -- e.g., work on individual projects in Core 8 (by Sharon Eisner, student tutor).

2. Do honors work in Core classes, not always the lowest common denominator.

3. Stimulate interest in and recommend follow-up courses to Core. Departments might create follow-up courses where they do not now exist.

4. Encourage individual and group projects in the science courses, e.g. a site study in geology.

5. Encourage faculty to teach in Core classes what excites and interests them. Let teachers depart from a set curriculum and do their own thing.

6. Have Core honors sections.

7. Separate some materials in class from testing so that advanced materials can be introduced without intimidating weaker students.

8. Separate lectures from labs in sciences to permit more innovation in lectures and allow discussion sessions, etc.

9. Have Core faculties meet each semester to evaluate their course and share information each semester.

10. Invite some students who have had Core courses to evaluate negative aspects with Core teachers.

11. Encourage more experimental and special section Core classes.

12. Let students take science Core courses early to see if they wish to continue in science. Loosen up the Tiers.

13. Have interdisciplinary, team-taught, small, serious seminars on themes: possibly mini courses without credit but mandatory.

14. Encourage high-credit major departments to reexamine their requirements to see if they can reduce them and make more room for electives.

Marvin Koenigsberg
Plenary Recorder

THIRD DAY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR (Final Session)

Open Forum Discussion - Thursday afternoon on Third Day Workshop Assignment.

The meeting started with verbal presentations from the afternoon workshops by Nicolas Papayanis (History), Ray Gittings (Mathematics), Evan Williams (Chemistry), and Edward Kent (Philosophy).

With three members of the Core Committee present, Philip Gallagher, Emily Michael and George Shapiro, the following comments were made by individual members of the faculty.

A suggestion was made that in the future the seminar be run in four days and for a shorter period each day instead of the intense three-day schedule as now.

The hope was expressed that more members of the Counseling Center participate in future seminars and that the counseling services be focused in greater degree on the Core curriculum.

A member of the Art department described the poor conditions of his room: it was overheated, poorly ventilated, noisy and employed primitive technology for such large classes.

Connection between Core coordinators should be re-established. A member of the Core committee acknowledged this deficiency and undertook to correct the mission.

Thanks were paid to the work of the peer tutors at this three day conference.

As Provost Wolfe is retiring statements of commendation about her involvement in the Core curriculum were made by Todd Lewis, Timothy Gura, and Sherman Van Solkema. It was generally felt that the end of an "epic" was now at hand.

Provost Wolfe gave the last word by reviewing her role in the Core and paying tribute to various associates, most notably Bruce Hoffacker.

A Closing Note of Thanks to

Ethyle R. Wolfe

Many persons are deserving of thanks for their special contributions to this summer seminar--all of you, indeed, for your participation in the work we have been engaged in. My admiration for you--faculty, students, visitors--grows on every such occasion as this.

But because she has announced her retirement during the next year from Brooklyn College and this is apparently to be the last in the seven-year series of summer seminars she has conducted for us, I would like to close by saying a few words in appreciation of Ethyle Wolfe's heroic contribution to academic life at Brooklyn College, the City University of New York, and, increasingly, to the academic posture of other institutions of higher learning throughout the nation.

For us, at the end of another rich and inspiring summer seminar, it is almost enough to say that Ethyle Wolfe has made occasions like this possible. In one or two sentences at the end of a fully-packed day I cannot adequately characterize the extent of our debt to Ethyle, but I would like a few things to be acknowledged:

1) First of all, the sense of collegiality for which Brooklyn College is famous--in an underground way as a direct result of our visitors if not in the national press--is due not only to all of you but to the catalyst in our midst. People respond to Ethyle's private blend of intellect, insight, hard-nosed practical wisdom, but most of all to her exuberance and joy in learning and teaching.

2) These summer seminars are her invention. Having just given thanks to all of you--faculty, students, visitors, our irreplaceable adjutant Bruce Hoffacker, our imaginative and hard-working committees--let me say that, nevertheless, on this front we owe everything to Ethyle. We are in a hard spot: I believe that Brooklyn College will probably fall back on hard times if we do not find ways to continue these pathbreaking seminars; but we will also be in a hard place when, without Ethyle, we try to keep them going.

3) Given all this, and knowing Ethyle as you and I do, I would like to acknowledge that the core curriculum as an idea--as it has crystallized at Brooklyn College and despite all its remaining shortcomings--owes very much to the thrust of Ethyle's life work. She has never worked alone, but she has always provided leadership. No one would say that ours is the only way to proceed, but under Ethyle's leadership the Brooklyn college way has become a unique and powerful educational force, both for our own students and--as we learn from our visitors--in the educational life of the nation.

-- Sherman Van Solkema
for the Planning Committee

WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
OF NEBRASKA

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1988 JUL 11 AM 11: 34

When I first visited Brooklyn College in the fall of 1986 I was both excited about and awed by the success of the Core Curriculum. In the fall of 1986 I thought it almost miraculous that Brooklyn College had a faculty so willing to adopt a core curriculum and to follow through on their obligation to make the core coherent. I thought the faculty must be extraordinary; unlike faculty at my or any other institution, they seemed amazingly ready to give up turf, to abandon traditional and disciplinary approaches, and to embrace the core concept.

When I returned during the week of June 6, 1988 I was even more excited and awed. This time, however, I realized that the Brooklyn College faculty are, indeed, like faculty at my institution and elsewhere. In fact, as I sat through the sessions, the positions fervently held, indeed, even the words used to express those positions were strikingly, almost frighteningly, similar to those I have heard at my present institution and other institutions where I have worked. This revelation of the worm in the garden is a source of hope. Brooklyn College is the real world; it has real life faculty members. But it implemented and is sustaining a core curriculum--other institutions have some hope of reform. I realize, too, that the reform was not a miracle but the result of the dedication and work of one or two key people--an apparently unbeatable team of Ethyle Wolfe and Sherman Van Solkema. I remain convinced that no such sweeping reform could have taken place without the intense commitment of an administrator who had the clout to support the program financially and a faculty member who was attuned both to the administrative and faculty issues in evoking reform. Faculty members have now assumed more responsibility for leadership and the programs will thus continue.

Perceptions of Faculty Seminars

In one of the workshops the discussion focused on what distinguishes core courses from other introductory courses. In addition to citing the characteristics of the core courses listed on page 6 of THE CORE CURRICULUM, faculty pointed out that core courses may be interdisciplinary, disciplinary, or team taught. Above all, they said coherence is the key concept and the major contributing factor in the success of the core. They also readily agreed that dedication to the principle of "covering the territory" is a major contributing factor to the failure of core courses. Obviously, both the organizers of and the participants in the faculty seminar were well aware that the lack of success of the cores in world cultures, sciences, and art/music stemmed at least partially from a lack of coherence. Thus, the focus of the seminar was precise and the organization right on target.

Core 9

At the risk of stating the obvious, I offer the following observations: A key issue in this core seems to be that of departments' lack of commitment to the core and to the organization of the course. Given the assumption that faculty are free to choose areas they are interested in and thus have a real incentive to participate in Core 9, logistics seem to be a major issue and that is a department chair problem. Someone, whether it is the chair of the department or of the Faculty Council Committee, must take responsibility for choosing faculty (perhaps even having a contingency plan in the case of resignations, etc.) and for establishing an organizational meeting of the faculty participants--preferably before the academic term begins. This appears to be an extremely simple remedy--but in the workshop I attended, faculty participants said it had not happened, with the result, of course, that in some instances texts had not been chosen or agreed upon before the opening session. Faculty must meet together before the academic year begins to map out the course--to establish some common themes, to agree upon texts, to set up exam dates and concepts to be covered, and to provide some transitions between segments of the course.

At two different institutions, I have experimented with interdisciplinary, team-taught courses as well as modular courses. In both instances, the modular approach was more successful. First the team-taught course is an expensive route, calling for an administrative commitment year after year. Second, in their evaluations students frequently stated that faculty seemed to be more intent on talking to and for each other than to students. The modular approach is not as expensive, can be well organized (simply because on the surface it is so apparent that it must be), and students (particularly students of the 80's) respond well to overt structure.

Perhaps three faculty members could be responsible for three sections of the core course, participate in all three on a rotation basis but receive credit for one course. That is, they would teach a total of fifteen weeks but in three different sections for five weeks each. This approach would mean the faculty member responsible for the first five weeks would schedule a meeting with the faculty member responsbile for the second five weeks, etc. The difficulty in the current approach seems to be that students are overwhelmed by adjusting to three different personalities addressing three different cultures from, in some instances, three different disciplines. A structure that demands that faculty meet together periodically outside of class will help continuity. As suggested in the seminar, a thematic approach will also help. Perhaps faculty could focus on those aspects of human life that are commonly shared, choosing a theme of work, family, and religion.

Core 7

The difficulties in the science core appear more complex than the problems in the other cores. First, the question of the relationship of the number and kind of details or facts (which must be memorized) to broad concepts seems more pressing than in the other core courses. This question is compounded by two factors: a) the vast number of details/facts and b) a majority of the science faculty at the seminar seemed to think that many of those details or facts are essential to understanding broad concepts. The science faculty objected to a course that focuses only on current issues or crises in science and society because it may not prepare students to think about the next crisis in science and life. Secondly, the labs compound the problem in the course because they raise a whole series of questions and, in effect, are taught by a second, parallel, faculty--the lab assistants.

In response to the first set of issues, only the members of the science faculty at Brooklyn College can ultimately determine what students must know. My impression is that many members of the science faculty have not confronted the question of what they want students to know, given the parameters of the core concept. Obviously, they need to answer the question and then proceed to organize a course. One positive suggestion made in our workshop was for Chemistry/Biology and Physics/Geology to be taught together. If science faculty think that will work, chances are it will, if for no other reason than the fact that they suggested it and thus must be somewhat committed to it. With the exception of the geology and physics faculty members, it does not appear that many science faculty members are committed to the current approach.

With regard to the issue of the labs, the core obviously has a problem if students make statements such as "I do not have one good thing to say about the labs" or "I didn't know why we were playing with the tinker toys." Two issues must be addressed. First, what is the function of the labs (why do science faculty members want students in a lab—to learn about the wonders of discovery? to learn new concepts? to study in depth or at first hand the concepts learned in the lectures? to learn about the scientific method? to learn about the subjective nature of scientific research?)? Secondly, in those instances (such as geology) where the faculty had a clear idea about the reason for the labs and even had a clear set of projects for students to focus on, the purpose was lost in translation (so to speak). As I suggested in the plenary, the science faculty might wish to make a week of training mandatory for lab assistants. During that week, the lab assistants would not only have a copy of the course outline and discuss the concepts to be covered during the term but also would have some basic instruction in pedagogy. I would add that the labs could provide an excellent opportunity for some experiments in writing across the curriculum. Scientific writing, with its demand for clarity, precision, and thoroughness is a "natural" for talking about writing and its connection to critical thinking and clarity of expression—it also provides a natural forum for discussion of style and such matters as the use of the passive voice and even of the question of why much contemporary scientific writing relies so heavily on simple and compound sentences.

Core 2

The workshop I attended focused on the core course in music. If the music core is not as successful as some of the other cores, it may be because the course attempts to cover too much territory (a list of eight goals/objectives/concepts appears on the course outline). In addition, the course appears to share the science core's problem of having assignments whose objective or raison d'etre have been lost. For example, the student in our workshop said the listening and writing assignments were not taken seriously by students and were seen as "hoops they had to jump through." The first problem can be addressed by having music faculty determine, bottom line, what is important to students, given the parameters of time, etc. The second problem can be addressed by having music faculty meet with members of the writing center (or English Department) to discuss methods of improving the writing assignments. Music faculty might be reminded, for example, that every piece of writing does not need a grade. Students might be asked to keep a

APPENDIX

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

Appraisal of

Faculty Development Seminar

Core Curriculum Project

Brooklyn College

by

Robert J. Frankle

Memphis State University

An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action University

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

The Faculty Development Seminar I attended from June 6 through 10 at Brooklyn College was likened by its organizers to a sandwich. It began and ended with a day's discussion among 12 visitors and approximately 6 Brooklyn faculty and administrators. In the intervening three days, we participated in the developmental seminar for Brooklyn College's own faculty. Since these three days formed the meat of the sandwich, let me begin with them.

From my visitor's perspective, these three days were far more valuable than all the canned presentations and articles I have been exposed to by institutions ballyhooing their new general education programs. One learned much more about both the potential and the problems of a core curriculum by "listening in" to a group of concerned and affected faculty discussing critical issues surrounding it, without such discussion being filtered for external consumption. I think Brooklyn College deserves enormous credit for both its openness and its courage in allowing 12 outsiders such an intimate view of its program, warts and all. In this regard, the ratio of 12 visitors to some 60 Brooklyn faculty seems about right. A larger proportion of visitors might inhibit discussion, at least to the extent of Brooklynites feeling obliged to explain their program to the visitors (which, in fact, did happen on days 1 and 5 of the seminar, the days of the outer loafs).

I thought each day's seminar was well structured, though sometimes tending to lag behind schedule (a typical academic failing). Student

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

participation was especially valuable and my sense was that the Brooklyn faculty also benefited from hearing student perceptions (though some tended to dismiss these particular students as atypical). The teaching samplers seemed a good idea, though a couple were a bit artificial, as they centered around discussion of a text which the rest of us had not read. (I wondered whether reading of the text could not be required beforehand. Or if that is not possible, then Prof. Wolfe's excellent use of excerpts as focus of discussion seems a promising approach).

On several occasions, the seminar broke down into smaller discussion groups, where key issues began to be systematically addressed. Yet I always came away from these groups feeling that the surface had just been scratched, that the discussion had been terminated too quickly, that they could have profitably used more time to explore the solutions that were beginning to be proposed. Notes were taken at each discussion group and I understand will be used by the Core Committee as it continues to address the problems raised in the seminar. But even if this does not happen, the very vitality of the seminar and discussions suggests that they will have a beneficial effect, if only in stimulating Brooklyn faculty to think together about the purpose of the core and their own teaching strategies to achieve this purpose. Indeed, I found myself wishing several times that such stimulating pedagogical discussions could take place on my campus.

One final reflection on the three day seminar. I could not help but notice the great impact made by the presentation of an alternative Science

An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action University

course by Professor Roger Blumberg of Columbia University. This, I am sure, was due mainly to the high quality of his presentation. But still I was left wondering whether more external presentations might not be beneficial. For example, during my small group's discussion of writing, I was surprised by the naivete - at least by Brooklyn College standards - of many of the comments. Here was a case - or so it seemed to me - where the Brooklyn faculty could benefit from a presentation by a national authority on ways to incorporate writing across the curriculum.

The two days without the Brooklyn faculty - Monday and Friday - seemed less successful, probably because they were less focussed. The outline for these two days seemed promising, but was not followed strictly. The final session in particular meandered in and around the topic of assessment. The lack of direction made this the least successful day.

Part of the problem, I think, was that the Monday and Friday sessions equivocated between two valid goals - (1) preparation for, and refection upon, the Brooklyn faculty seminar and (2) sharing ideas and experiences about general education in a national context. These two goals are, of course, not incompatible, but without very careful planning the tension between the two can diffuse the discussion. Personally, I left on Friday with a feeling of lost opportunity - a regret that I had not learned very much about the General Education programs and experiences of the other institutions involved in the visitor's program. In this regard, I would like to endorse a suggestion made by one of my colleagues that the visitors write

An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action University

a brief description of their institution's activities regarding general education and distribute this ahead of time. I also regret, in retrospect, my financially motivated decision to stay with relatives. Had I lodged in the same hotel as the other visitors, I might have come to know them, and their programs better.

An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action University

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

Having assessed the Development Seminar itself, let me step back and make some observation about the Core based on my Summer experience. Some of the discussion sounded quite familiar. The problem of non-English speaking graduate assistants, for example, is heard on most large campuses and Brooklyn seems no closer to solving it than the rest of us. Of greater interest, to me at least, was the issue of class size. While I am sure other factors were involved, I was struck, when reading the Raskin Evaluation Report, by the apparently close correlation between the perceived success of a core course and its size. The courses receiving the most criticism - 2.1, 7, 8, and 9 - also were those with the largest class size. Another theme with its counterpart on my campus is the tension between commonalty and individual autonomy. I suppose I was surprised to see this, since I had always associated Brooklyn in mind with emphasis on the common experience. Yet Core 9, for example, seemed to be taught in vastly different ways and most of the faculty seemed to be advocating more individual discretion, not less. On the other hand, one of the peer tutors complained to me over lunch that a couple of the instructors of Core 3 ignore the topic of gender, thought its syllabus seems to promise this will be included. How much diversity should be allowed in a core course thus seems a live, and unresolved, question at Brooklyn.

But while Brooklyn is still struggling with some of the problems that haunt the rest of us, it is remarkable how they seem to have solved - or escaped - conundrums that plague many schools, including mine. One is the conflict caused by increasing emphasis on research. Many faculty at Memphis

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

State have resented requests to work on developing new core courses, or putting more time into the teaching and grading of them, grumbling that they cannot afford to take time away from their research when there is so much pressure to publish. Yet when this issue was raised on Friday by Professor Schonhorn from Southern Illinois, those from Brooklyn seemed to have difficulty perceiving the problem. Evidently, their core was not achieved at the expense of research and scholarship. Yet one of its most impressive aspects is the obvious willingness of its faculty to devote lots of time, energy, and thought to discussing the core courses, as well as to teaching them.

But even more impressive - almost miraculous from my point of view - was the virtual absence of turfism. One faculty member did intimate to me over lunch that the core's construction was motivated partly by a desire to rescue a couple of "endangered" departments. But even he did not want to change the core. Indeed, everyone seemed to accept the basic structure of the core. Problems with some of the courses were certainly acknowledged and a number of solutions, some of them quite radical, were propounded. But none entailed replacing one department or discipline with another.

This, to me, represents the real achievement of the Brooklyn core. It has become a common source of pride for the faculty and a common catalyst for bringing faculty together to discuss common pedagogical problems and aims. This is quite a contrast from the typical body-snatching contest that marks most general education programs. From my perspective, that is the truly amazing feat.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

Our Lady of Holy Cross College
Innovators in Education Since 1916

4123 WOODLAND DRIVE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70131-7399 (504) 394-7744

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1990 JUL 27 AM 11: 10

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK
CORE SUMMER SEMINAR

Reverend Thomas E. Chambers, C.S.C., Ph.D.

Being a "Summer Associate" was a meaningful learning experience for many reasons which I shall give. The experience was a "process" of group development and positive growth, since the people invited were faculty, CORE faculty, administrators, and Summer Associates who interacted with ideas, suggestions, criticisms, but yet what brought them to such exchange was the "CORE Curriculum." Although an established agenda was in hand, the "hidden agenda" gave life and witness to an authentic exchange of opinions and insights. The learning climate was vibrant, interesting, but always with challenge.

The "presentations," "samplers," and discussions were open for response and clarification. People said what they wanted, and responded if the need was present. Professionalism was present and it was surrounded by friendliness; certainly, collegiality was occurring between all who were involved. There was a dynamic in place, though subtle; it was a cohesive factor bringing the membership to speak, think, reflect CORE. Our purpose of coming together was finding ways and means of examining a "curriculum" with a desire to improve.

It was obvious to me that complacency was not happening because the membership realized that to find better and more meaningful methods is a must. The "Process" reviewed strengths and attempted to analyze the weaknesses. Science was discussed, which, by the way, is an old age problem, but the discussion was an attempt to unify, strengthen and ultimately improve a specific concern. Agitation was not destructing the process, but rather giving the Seminar a new life towards what possibly can be.

The composition of the faculty was as diversified as the student body. Student CORE tutors, some only with a one year experience, gave their experience with appreciation. To think that such students could confidently stand before their faculty and then with excellent articulation, render a positive experience! These perceptions were most helpful and meaningful.

The entire "Faculty Development Seminar" had much content and it was a marvelous learning experience.

O.C

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1988 JUL 13 AM 11: 25

To: Ethyle Wolfe, Provost, Brooklyn College
Carol Paul, Vice President, Suffolk Community College

From: Richard W. Fox, Professor of History RWF

Subject: Report on the Brooklyn College Faculty Development Seminar, June 6-10, 1988

Date: June 21, 1988

The Brooklyn College faculty development seminar described the origins and continuing evolution of the Brooklyn College core curriculum and demonstrated how the key to the success of that project has been the deep and broad based involvement of faculty and administration in teaching. For the Summer Associates, the essence of their seminar experience broke down into three major areas: the core process itself, which the visitors focused on in their own meetings and then directly experienced in plenary sessions with the Brooklyn faculty; an analysis of the critical issues that confront any core curriculum including definitions, the role of the faculty, and the impact of the core upon students; and finally, case studies of the operation of the core process that focused on the perceived weaknesses of core courses 9 (Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American Cultures) and 7-8 (Science in Modern Life) and on examples of actual classes called "samplers" that met specific objectives of the core such as writing across the curriculum and creating an impetus for lifelong learning. Summer Associates were able throughout the week to compare and contrast the Brooklyn experience with their own institutions.

The seminar provided the visitors with a three-step introduction to the core process. We first heard descriptions of the process from leading participants and followed up in small group discussions where we compared the Brooklyn experience with that of our respective institutions. Next, we joined Brooklyn faculty in actual summer workshops and became part of the core curriculum process at Brooklyn. Finally, we explored ways to assess and evaluate a new curriculum after implementation.

The most important lesson learned from this part of the seminar is that the essence of a core curriculum is process, not product; that the Brooklyn core is in a continual state of "becoming," a work in progress that is never complete; and that "an unexamined curriculum is not worth teaching" (Ethyle Wolfe). Key to the successful completion of the five stage core process described by Sherman Van Solkema is for a small group of faculty to share a common vision for general education and then slowly win over the bulk of the faculty through the drafting of very concrete models and course syllabi that give faculty discussions focus and direction. General statements of goals and objectives, somewhat surprisingly, were written at Brooklyn <u>after</u> course syllabi were developed and emerged from faculty discussions and workshops as a shared educational philosophy.

Extensive debate made clear that there were only a small number of potential curricular models and that a mixed model, combining a first tier of required courses and a second tier of distributional requirements that allow for a narrow range of student choice, was a viable alternative.

In addition to examining the core process, the summer seminar also encouraged Summer Associates to grapple with several critical issues raised by a core curriculum. A major question is how do you know whether a core curriculum, or any curriculum, is really being successful? In the final session, an important distinction was drawn between "assessment" and "evaluation." As Donald Cress from Northern Illinois University (and FIPSE) pointed out, assessment involves an attempt to quantify faculty performance and is almost always imposed by politicians and bureaucrats outside academia who distrust faculty and may themselves be anti-intellectual. Assessment is usually limited to only a portion of the cognitive domain, often only basic skills, excludes the affective domain completely, and relies on limited optical scanner test instruments. Instead of using these tests for diagnostic purposes, they are frequently given "sumative" uses in order to compare institutions and their relative merit for continued funding, clearly an improper use of the tests. The perverse logic of using a "value added" approach to outcomes evaluation assessment is clear when we consider that Miami Dade Community College would perform better than Harvard by this measurement. As President Hess of Brooklyn College pointed out, a "longitudinal statistical analysis" of Brooklyn's core curriculum gives a product that focuses on data and facts, not human qualities and, while it may reveal important information about student choices, it cannot offer an evaluation of the quality of a curriculum or of the articulated educational philosophy. In contrast, an evaluation design, according to Bruce Hofacker, should include assessment based on an analysis of student transcripts but should go on to examine student and faculty perceptions of the core through in-depth interviews. Nevertheless, there was general agreement that Brooklyn College had failed to devise means for compiling assessment data and a research design for evaluation when the core curriculum was first introduced and that it would indeed have been desirable to have done so.

Another important issues involved definitions: what does Brooklyn College really mean by a "core curriculum?" At Brooklyn a model core means a prescribed set of liberal arts courses taken by all students including non-liberal arts majors (just two non-liberal arts programs represent 54% of all students at Brooklyn). There is no provision for student choice in this general education requirement. Its purpose is not to prepare students for a particular major or profession but to broaden horizons and develop the mind. As a group, the core

courses should stress varying modes of inquiry as well as content, including definitive human achievements across a broad range of the liberal arts. In each course, stress is placed on the quality and depth of exposure rather than breadth of coverage.

The key advantages of this type of model core are "commonality" and "coherence." The "commonality" feature means all students share a common intellectual foundation, a common point of reference, and a common language that serves as the basis for sustained learning and rational discourse. "Coherence" means that there are integrative links between the individual core courses to indicate that knowledge must ultimately transcend the confines of single disciplines and counteract the narrowness of professional training. This is not to say that a core curriculum should present a monolithic, integrated, all-inclusive body of knowledge, but each core course needs to make connections with other core courses in order that the program as a whole makes sense to the student. The goal of a core curriculum is thus similar to the goal of general education as advanced in the Harvard Report of 1946: that there is a certain organic unity to knowledge, that students need preparation to act as free individuals and as citizens in society, not simply as doctors, engineers, business men, or accountants, and that the aim is mastery of life with wisdom the indispensable means to this end. A distributional curriculum is much less likely to embody this kind of "commonality" and "coherence" because of the great number and diversity of courses involved.

Another critical issue is that a core curriculum should be perceived as part of a continuum of student growth. A core can be effective only if students have already attained the college level skills demanded in a college curriculum. The Brooklyn core is further subdivided into two tiers with the emphasis in reading, writing, and interpretive skills in the five courses of Tier I serving as a foundation for more advanced work in the five courses of Tier II. The whole core concept recognizes that students mature through time and that skills developed in the core should be a starting point for specialization in a major and, hopefully, lifelong learning.

Perhaps the most critical issue for the successful implementation of a core curriculum is the need for active faculty involvement. The Brooklyn success is directly attributable to a small group of passionately involved faculty and administrators who possessed a vision and through countless hours of discussions and debates over several years inspired a consensus among the entire faculty for a new curricular design. Neither a small group of faculty nor the administration could have produced a substantive change on their own. In addition, Brooklyn developed vehicles for mobilizing faculty involvement that also helped

channel faculty energies. The core was initially created as an outgrowth of a college-wide faculty seminar meeting every evening for a week and open to all 800 faculty members. Summer seminars of fifty to seventy faculty meet several days each summer to examine particular aspects of the core. They include faculty from departments that do not teach core courses as well as counsellors and students. A visitor's program also produced a steady stream of non-Brooklyn faculty from across the country whose comments and perspectives greatly strengthened Brooklyn's core program.

In the end, it was also the faculty that benefited most from the core. For those who invested their time, energy, and creativity, there were tremendous rewards in terms of improved collegiality (faculty from different departments got to know one another and exchanged ideas across disciplines for the first time), a renewed interest in the art of good teaching, and much greater sensitivity to the needs of the new type of student entering colleges in the 1980's. In the advanced courses of their specialties, faculty have also relied on the core and can build upon what all students have studied in common. There is no need to keep teaching introductory courses even at the advanced level (as often occurs with a distributional model) because with a core student learning is cumulative, not scattered and impressionistic.

Nor can the students be ignored. Although it is not for the students to decide whether there should be a core and in what areas, student perceptions are important, and the issues they raise must be addressed. In the beginning, students tend to see the core as a forbidding monolith but after completing the ten courses they gain a great sense of accomplishment. At Brooklyn, a student survey showed 51% of those questioned believed that students should <u>not</u> have a choice in selecting courses to satisfy general education requirements. Student complaints about particular core courses have led to syllabus changes and summer workshops. Students still have difficulty with the demanding texts and extensive writing assignments in all ten core courses which have been partially met by a peer-tutoring system and a new faculty-student mentor program. Nevertheless, there are still difficulties. The CUNY writing assessment required of all students does not accurately reflect the demands of the core courses, and there is the perennial problem of getting the weaker students (instead of the top students) to take advantage of peer tutors and faculty mentors. As Sherman Van Solkema said, no student should be allowed to remain mute for an entire semester.

One last major issue was dealt with briefly: Brooklyn found it impossible for practical and administrative reasons to design a core around an explicit theme or to make all core courses interdisciplinary. Most core courses are taught solely by members of one department from the perspective of a single discipline.*

The third and last phase of the seminar was an analysis by all eighty-five participants of Core 9 (Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American Cultures) and Core 7-8 (Science in Modern Life) which provided the Summer Associates with case studies of Brooklyn's core process. Individual faculty presented sample classes in the plenary sessions after which participants were broken up into small workshops to discuss particular issues and to return with concrete recommendations for further discussion and comment by the entire group. These efforts appeared to produce a consensus for important changes in Core 9. Core 7-8 remains a problem; the science faculty does not yet appear to have succeeded in creating genuine core courses, only half-semester mini-courses in physics, chemistry, biology, and geology.

Core 9 attempts to make students appreciate cultures other than their own, and its structure is unique. The course is team-taught by three faculty from each of the area studies covered, it is modular with the course broken up into segments on Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and it is multi-disciplinary in that history, literature, or art may be the focal point of a module. The challenge of Core 9 is that liberal learning must be made global, and its

*The term "interdisciplinary" can cause confusion because of its many meanings. At one extreme, an interdisciplinary course is one that is team-taught by members of different disciplines who seek to break down the boundaries between their specialties in order to create a synthesis. A weaker version of the term applies to courses that are not team-taught but synthesize several disciplines. This type of course may be taught by a faculty member from any of the disciplines involved. Finally, at the other extreme, an interdisciplinary course can be one that is taught by one faculty member from any of several disciplines, but the course design does not require a synthesis of material from more than one of the several disciplines that teach the course. In addition, an entire curriculum, not just a course, may be considered interdisciplinary if it is designed around an explicitly interdisciplinary theme or if all or most of its courses are interdisciplinary in any of the three senses given above. The Brooklyn curriculum is not interdisciplinary in any of these ways, although two core courses, Core 9 (described below) and Core 3 (People, Power, and Politics) are interdisciplinary in the first and second sense respectively.

success can be measured in a student survey which reports three-quarters of those surveyed felt increased respect for people of different backgrounds. The fallacy of Core 9, however, has been to put in the same classroom three different teachers from three different macro-regions using three different methods of analysis and to assume that because the teachers are doing what they do best, a cohesive and comprehensible course will result. What should be common to all three modules? How do you keep the students from being overwhelmed? Core 9 illustrates the formidable obstacles to any course that seeks to do justice to the diversity of world cultures. Still, it is clear that students will benefit from at least one team-teaching experience.

Core 7-8 is too frequently bogged down in a multitude of detail and suffers from too rapid coverage of too many topics. The science core needs to focus on basic principles, intellectual imagination, and the nature of science generally in order for students to make connections with other liberal arts courses and between science and their own lives. Many science core classes are not carrying out the principles of the core curriculum as indicated by non-science faculty visitations to science lectures. These faculty observed students talking and eating during class, walking in and out, and generally displaying total passivity to the learning process. There were several suggestions on how to make the science core not just mastery of a collection of facts but understanding the scientific way of knowing. Presentations were made by Roger Blumberg describing the innovative Columbia University science model and by Brian Schwarz explaining a thematic approach to the teaching of science to non-majors which stresses the unity of science and its great importance into the lives of everyone.

In conclusion, the final question is what are the lessons of the Brooklyn core experience for Suffolk Community College? At first glance it would appear that a large, selective four year institution with a distinguished list of faculty publications has little in common with a two year, multi-campus community college. Indeed, Suffolk's faculty does not have the specialists to teach Core I on the classical world or Core 9 on the non-western world on a college-wide scale. Still, there is much in the Brooklyn experience that can be instructive for Suffolk. We share common pedogogical concerns, and the process utilized by Brooklyn for dealing with these concerns has universal validity. Both institutions face the need to maintain enrollments with underprepared students who do not often share a common culture with the faculty. Both institutions need to offer a curriculum with some coherence that students can comprehend and find meaning in and that faculty can be committed to. Both need to revitalize a faculty with a large percentage of senior professors. In both colleges, moreover, the process of curricular formulation needs to be based in

the faculty because only the faculty can generate a consensus on educational goals and educational philosophy and work to realize those goals in the classroom. Programs will remain superficial catalog statements without large scale faculty involvement and without hard work on the actual syllabi and bibliographies necessary to build consensus and commitment throughout the institution. In this area, Brooklyn College is clearly different from Suffolk but worthy of emulation. Widespread faculty participation in curricular reform will likely create a better design and promote faculty development as well. A dynamic process of on-going curricular development is needed to identify and continually refine a common body of learning appropriate for our students. This process must be institutionalized as a permanent part of the teaching enterprise. The impressive collegiality and sense of renewal so evident at Brooklyn College is in large measure due to faculty involvement in the core curricular process.

RWF/st

cc: Dean Canniff
Members of the Western Campus General Studies Committee

Patricia Silber
Marymount College
Tarrytown, NY

Brooklyn College
Faculty Development Seminar
June 6-10, 1988

While my participation as a summer associate in the Faculty Development Seminar yielded many valuable practical suggestions to enrich the Humanities Program at Marymount College, my most rewarding experiences were less tangible: sensing the strength of collegiality among faculty, both Core and non-Core, peer tutors, and visitors: the openness to discussion and subsequent change: the college-wide enthusiasm and concern for the Core.

I admired the frequently reiterated view of all participants that the Core is a work in progress that calls for continuing experimentation. Also enlightening was the distinction made between purpose and content of Core courses and those of a discipline's introductory courses. And, of course, those key terms empowerment, connections, and commonality pointed to shared goals of the highest quality.

What follows are reflections on specific activities and assertions.

1. The comments of the poised and articulate peer tutors were especially valuable as indicators of student response to the Core. The generally favorable findings of Raskin and Owens on student attitudes were emphatically confirmed by the peer tutors, both in their thoughtful assessments of the courses with which they work and in their explanation of reactions of fellow students and those they tutor. Their advocacy of diagnostic testing, surprise quizzes, and essay exams showed a mature approach to their Core courses.

2. I was pleased to learn of the seriousness with which the College takes writing across the Core. However, at the workshop in which I participated, on writing in the sciences, a questionable assumption was especially apparent: scientists do not write, or at least not in the same sense as do humanists. Biology Professor Norman Levin argued strongly against this perception, as did Professor Jerome Megna and this writer. Since Roger Blumberg's model relies heavily on the use of scientific papers to teach non-scientists, and Brian Schwartz proposes team teaching by a scientist and a humanist, there is some irony in the expressed belief of workshop participants that a qualitative difference exists between writing done by scientists and by non-scientists. I found Professor Levin's insistence that observations written in lab reports amount to much more than filling in the blanks convincing, and was impressed by his refusal to give multiple-choice exams.

In a related matter, David Seidemann's assertion that a scientist in one discipline can handle a Core course that provides instruction and insight into other science disciplines was a useful reminder of the Core's purpose: to provide, as someone remarked, the ability to read with pleasure half of the articles in the Tuesday science pages of the New York Times. Most important, scientists and humanists discussed these questions openly and without rancor, further evidence of collegiality.

3. Although the problems of Core 9 are familiar to anyone concerned with a course aiming to introduce students to other cultures (See Stanley N. Kurtz's letter to the New York Times 6/23/88), the model for the course is sound, exposing students as it does to a multi-disciplinary approach. The problems discussed were in the execution, particularly in staffing. It can never be easy to find

three faculty members available for a team-taught course; because the coordinator must work within the requirements of several departments, this problem will persist. Nevertheless, the suggestions made in my workshop held promise that would repay attempting them: thematic or values-centered approaches, experimental one-teacher sections, concentration on language as a shaper of culture.

4. Sampler presentations demonstrated more than pedagogical strategies. They pointed the way for students to integrate knowledge gained in specific Core courses with the rest of the Core and with the rest of their baccalaureate experience, leading them to make the all-important connections that are a key goal of the Core. It may be significant that the most informative of the samples, those of Professors Buncombe, Michael, and Wolfe, were presented with little audio-visual assistance. Because of my own weakness in math, I was disappointed that technical problems made it difficult to appreciate Professor Gerson Levin's fascinating demonstration.

5. The question of how successfully Core courses led to further electives in liberal arts narrowed, in my workshop, to counting how many students took further courses in a specified discipline. This might more profitably have addressed the task described in the program as "the Core as a starting point for life-long learning."

As I look over these notes, I find that I, whose discipline is English literature, have dealt at some length with science. This is probably because I am distressed, at my own institution and elsewhere, to see humanities and sciences so often divided into opposing camps. It was refreshing to experience during this seminar at least a partial toppling of the barrier between

the two.

For this, and for all of the above reasons, especially its dedication to faculty development, I left the seminar with a genuine appreciation of the Brooklyn College Core Curriculum and the continuing efforts by everyone involved to make it more effective. I am grateful for having had the chance to participate and inspired by all I learned as a participant.

COMMENTS ON THE SUMMER ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
BROOKLYN COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM PROJECT

Bettie M. Smolansky
Moravian College

Participation as a Summer Associate in the 1988 Brooklyn College Core Curriculum Project Faculty Development Seminar was for me a rewarding experience, both personally and professionally. Indeed, it was an intensive set of experiences, so diverse that I have found it impossible to develop a nice, coherent framework for my evaluative comments.

Therefore, I have decided simply to list a series of numbered comments/suggestions on a range of topics:

1. The initial sessions with your summer associates would probably be more productive if each of them were asked to submit a brief description of his/her home institution and its general education program several weeks prior to the beginning of the workshop. (A statement of each's expectations and "needs" might also be useful to those planning the workshop.) These could be duplicated and sent to all participants so they could familiarize themselves with this background information in advance.

2. The Core Booklet which was shared with all workshop participants is due for an update. (Again, an advance copy of such a document would be helpful to Summer Associates.) The process of producing this revised version may well prove to be a salutary one for the Core Committee, for it will require them to think anew about the core's goals and objectives, as well as its way and means. A practical suggestion vis-a-vis such a booklet also comes readily to mind; i.e., since detailed, syllabus-style course outlines almost always suffer from rapid obsolescense they should be included only in a readily replaceable appendix.

3. Two features of the current workshop stand out in my mind as deserving of comment:

   a. The Core Samplers -- while I enjoyed most of the samplers offered at this workshop very much as intellectual experiences, I am not persuaded that they are the most time-effective mechanism for stimulating serious thinking about the pedagogy or appropriate content of the core. Both the small group workshops and the pedagogically-focused presentations (such as those on teaching science) seemed to me to be superior for this purpose. I would especially urge the provision of slightly more time for small group sessions. The groups of which I was a part always seemed to have difficulty concluding the task(s) assigned in the time allowed.

   b. By all means do continue to include your peer tutors as both presenters and full-scale participants in your workshops. They

never failed to inject a laudable note of practical reality into our discussions, a tone which academics assembled are want to lose if left to their own devices.

4. I understand the frustrations that have led your science faculty to reorganize the Science half courses so that they will run for 14 rather than 7 weeks. However, based on experience at my own institution (where full courses are four-credit courses) with what we had labelled half courses, I would caution that strict oversight be exercised lest they become full courses. Though the classroom time will be only half that of "full" science courses, professors have a way of incrementally augmenting the amount of out-of-class work that they expect of students in such circumstances. (If they are being candid, most faculty will admit that the coverage quantity and/or demand level of 5 or 6 week summer courses is probably not completely the equal of the same course offered during a regular semester; the object lesson for the reverse situation is clear enough.)

5. A key concern at this point in its history (especially now that the long-awaited Raskin and Owen Report has been published) is on-going evaluation and assessment. Since some of my own scholarly preparation is in this field, I will hazard some relevant comments and suggestions.

First, it is well to keep in mind that evaluation studies generally are of one of two types: summative or formative. The former attempts to assess the adequacy of a program with some relative or absolute standards (at least implicit) against which outcomes are measured. The latter focuses instead upon process, and its ultimate objective is not to "grade" but to help improve a program. Unfortunately, most of the standard approaches which serve the one of these purposes well are poor for the other.

Therefore, I would recommend a kind of hybrid approach which combines the attention to sampling procedures that characterizes the typical summative survey and the focus on process which typifies formative studies. In practical terms, you should choose a demographically diverse (in terms of age, sex, race, ethnicity, and measured ability level), small sample of recent graduates who have completed the core and compare them with a comparable sample from student cohorts that graduated just before the core was introduced. Both groups should be subjected to what are known as focused interviews revolving partially around such perceptual questions as the following:

a) What was your best educational experience at Brooklyn College? Your worst? (& why?)

b) What should the college have done more of for you? (Less?)

c) What should we have required you to do more of for yourself?

These should then be augmented by a follow-up emphasis on more behaviorally focused questions such as these:

a) In what ways do you spend your leisure? (with follow-up probes for frequency and duration of such activities)

b) What kind of (and how much) reading do you do beyond that which is specifically required by your job/occupation?

Then conclude with some summative self-evaluation questions such as these:

a) How well (or poorly) has your college education prepared you for your career?

b) In what way has your college education impacted on your life apart from your career?

These are only sample, suggested questions, and people with specific expertise in interviewing from your own faculty/staff should be asked to give the matter careful thought. The cost per respondent of this kind of approach will be higher than the kind of standardized questionnaire approach apparently used in the Raskin and Owen study, but you should be able to generate more useful (in the formative sense) information from a much smaller sample. Moreover, training and using a group of graduate students in the social/behavioral sciences as your interviewers could also help cut costs and at the same time would provide those students with both some financial support and a valuable professional experience.

6. A final, general comment: As a visitor, I especially appreciated both the collegiality and the candor of the participating Brooklyn College faculty, staff, and students. We were treated to a "warts and all" view of Brooklyn's Core. Since the 1988 Faculty Development Seminar was focused primarily upon what are seen as major problem areas in the Core, this was perhaps inevitable. Even so, however, this observer (a faculty member for almost 25 years) was especially impressed by the openness with which problems were discussed and the pervasive positive spirit which most participants brought to the process. Even strongly-held, candidly-expressed conflicting views did not destroy the general spirit of collegiality.

And that brings me to my last point: Whatever its effect on your students has been and will continue to be, in my view, the most important direct effect of the Brooklyn Core Program has been on the College's faculty. In creating a Core Program you have provided for the creation of a cadre of faculty for whom the liberal education of your students is a key concern. In the process, you have reinvigorated not only Brooklyn College's institutional image, both internally and externally, but you have liberated some of your best teachers from the sometimes intellectually stifling disciplinary concerns which typically dominate our professional lives within collegiate departments. When Provost Wolfe suggested "Dead wood makes the best kindling," I believe it was this aspect of the process to which she was implicitly referring.

WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
OF NEBRASKA

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1988 JUL 11 AM 11: 34

When I first visited Brooklyn College in the fall of 1986 I was both excited about and awed by the success of the Core Curriculum. In the fall of 1986 I thought it almost miraculous that Brooklyn College had a faculty so willing to adopt a core curriculum and to follow through on their obligation to make the core coherent. I thought the faculty must be extraordinary; unlike faculty at my or any other institution, they seemed amazingly ready to give up turf, to abandon traditional and disciplinary approaches, and to embrace the core concept.

When I returned during the week of June 6, 1988 I was even more excited and awed. This time, however, I realized that the Brooklyn College faculty are, indeed, like faculty at my institution and elsewhere. In fact, as I sat through the sessions, the positions fervently held, indeed, even the words used to express those positions were strikingly, almost frighteningly, similar to those I have heard at my present institution and other institutions where I have worked. This revelation of the worm in the garden is a source of hope. Brooklyn College is the real world; it has real life faculty members. But it implemented and is sustaining a core curriculum--other institutions have some hope of reform. I realize, too, that the reform was not a miracle but the result of the dedication and work of one or two key people--an apparently unbeatable team of Ethyle Wolfe and Sherman Van Solkema. I remain convinced that no such sweeping reform could have taken place without the intense commitment of an administrator who had the clout to support the program financially and a faculty member who was attuned both to the administrative and faculty issues in evoking reform. Faculty members have now assumed more responsibility for leadership and the programs will thus continue.

Perceptions of Faculty Seminars

In one of the workshops the discussion focused on what distinguishes core courses from other introductory courses. In addition to citing the characteristics of the core courses listed on page 6 of THE CORE CURRICULUM, faculty pointed out that core courses may be interdisciplinary, disciplinary, or team taught. Above all, they said coherence is the key concept and the major contributing factor in the success of the core. They also readily agreed that dedication to the principle of "covering the territory" is a major contributing factor to the failure of core courses. Obviously, both the organizers of and the participants in the faculty seminar were well aware that the lack of success of the cores in world cultures, sciences, and art/music stemmed at least partially from a lack of coherence. Thus, the focus of the seminar was precise and the organization right on target.

Core 9

At the risk of stating the obvious, I offer the following observations: A key issue in this core seems to be that of departments' lack of commitment to the core and to the organization of the course. Given the assumption that faculty are free to choose areas they are interested in and thus have a real incentive to participate in Core 9, logistics seem to be a major issue and that is a department chair problem. Someone, whether it is the chair of the department or of the Faculty Council Committee, must take responsibility for choosing faculty (perhaps even having a contingency plan in the case of resignations, etc.) and for establishing an organizational meeting of the faculty participants--preferably before the academic term begins. This appears to be an extremely simple remedy--but in the workshop I attended, faculty participants said it had not happened, with the result, of course, that in some instances texts had not been chosen or agreed upon before the opening session. Faculty must meet together before the academic year begins to map out the course--to establish some common themes, to agree upon texts, to set up exam dates and concepts to be covered, and to provide some transitions between segments of the course.

At two different institutions, I have experimented with interdisciplinary, team-taught courses as well as modular courses. In both instances, the modular approach was more successful. First the team-taught course is an expensive route, calling for an administrative commitment year after year. Second, in their evaluations students frequently stated that faculty seemed to be more intent on talking to and for each other than to students. The modular approach is not as expensive, can be well organized (simply because on the surface it is so apparent that it must be), and students (particularly students of the 80's) respond well to overt structure.

Perhaps three faculty members could be responsible for three sections of the core course, participate in all three on a rotation basis but receive credit for one course. That is, they would teach a total of fifteen weeks but in three different sections for five weeks each. This approach would mean the faculty member responsible for the first five weeks would schedule a meeting with the faculty member responsbile for the second five weeks, etc. The difficulty in the current approach seems to be that students are overwhelmed by adjusting to three different personalities addressing three different cultures from, in some instances, three different disciplines. A structure that demands that faculty meet together periodically outside of class will help continuity. As suggested in the seminar, a thematic approach will also help. Perhaps faculty could focus on those aspects of human life that are commonly shared, choosing a theme of work, family, and religion.

Core 7

The difficulties in the science core appear more complex than the problems in the other cores. First, the question of the relationship of the number and kind of details or facts (which must be memorized) to broad concepts seems more pressing than in the other core courses. This question is compounded by two factors: a) the vast number of details/facts and b) a majority of the science faculty at the seminar seemed to think that many of those details or facts are essential to understanding broad concepts. The science faculty objected to a course that focuses only on current issues or crises in science and society because it may not prepare students to think about the next crisis in science and life. Secondly, the labs compound the problem in the course because they raise a whole series of questions and, in effect, are taught by a second, parallel, faculty--the lab assistants.

In response to the first set of issues, only the members of the science faculty at Brooklyn College can ultimately determine what students must know. My impression is that many members of the science faculty have not confronted the question of what they want students to know, given the parameters of the core concept. Obviously, they need to answer the question and then proceed to organize a course. One positive suggestion made in our workshop was for Chemistry/Biology and Physics/Geology to be taught together. If science faculty think that will work, chances are it will, if for no other reason than the fact that they suggested it and thus must be somewhat committed to it. With the exception of the geology and physics faculty members, it does not appear that many science faculty members are committed to the current approach.

With regard to the issue of the labs, the core obviously has a problem if students make statements such as "I do not have one good thing to say about the labs" or "I didn't know why we were playing with the tinker toys." Two issues must be addressed. First, what is the function of the labs (why do science faculty members want students in a lab--to learn about the wonders of discovery? to learn new concepts? to study in depth or at first hand the concepts learned in the lectures? to learn about the scientific method? to learn about the subjective nature of scientific research?)? Secondly, in those instances (such as geology) where the faculty had a clear idea about the reason for the labs and even had a clear set of projects for students to focus on, the purpose was lost in translation (so to speak). As I suggested in the plenary, the science faculty might wish to make a week of training mandatory for lab assistants. During that week, the lab assistants would not only have a copy of the course outline and discuss the concepts to be covered during the term but also would have some basic instruction in pedagogy. I would add that the labs could provide an excellent opportunity for some experiments in writing across the curriculum. Scientific writing, with its demand for clarity, precision, and thoroughness is a "natural" for talking about writing and its connection to critical thinking and clarity of expression--it also provides a natural forum for discussion of style and such matters as the use of the passive voice and even of the question of why much contemporary scientific writing relies so heavily on simple and compound sentences.

Core 2

The workshop I attended focused on the core course in music. If the music core is not as successful as some of the other cores, it may be because the course attempts to cover too much territory (a list of eight goals/objectives/concepts appears on the course outline). In addition, the course appears to share the science core's problem of having assignments whose objective or raison d'etre have been lost. For example, the student in our workshop said the listening and writing assignments were not taken seriously by students and were seen as "hoops they had to jump through." The first problem can be addressed by having music faculty determine, bottom line, what is important to students, given the parameters of time, etc. The second problem can be addressed by having music faculty meet with members of the writing center (or English Department) to discuss methods of improving the writing assignments. Music faculty might be reminded, for example, that every piece of writing does not need a grade. Students might be asked to keep a

ATTACHMENT E

Manuel Schonhorn
Professor of English &
American Literature
Southern Illinois University -
Carbondale

A SUMMER ASSOCIATE'S REPORT - CORE CURRICULUM PROJECT

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR - JUNE 6-10, 1988 *

At my first luncheon with the Brooklyn College faculty, a senior professor detected my accent and asked when I had graduated. "Brooklyn College, 1955," I replied. He noted that he had graduated in 1958, adding that there had been momentous changes in the past thirty years. "Quality has fallen tremendously since you left," he continued. "Years ago we used to send our best students to Harvard; now they only go to Berkeley."

Surprise, shock, and the natural reticence of a visitor prevented me from making the appropriate response. I could have pointed out the parochial elitism of the speaker. Eschewing insult, I could have observed that the University of California, Berkeley, is now the highest rated, the strongest, and the most prestigious graduate institution in the United States. And I could have explained that the decision of the Brooklyn College students, albeit the best, to venture across the continent, three thousand miles

---

*This report should be read in conjunction with my "Personal Report, Brooklyn College Visitors Program on the Core Curriculum, 1987" and the Workshop Assignments of the Faculty, June 1988. It will try not to duplicate nor paraphrase those earlier observations, criticisms, and recommendations.

from home and family and terrain that had nourished them, bespoke an adventurousness, a moral strength, and an emotional security that, in the long run, would count much more than simple academic superiority.

The anecdote dramatically reveals the strange, disquieting, and problematic response of the College faculty to the students they are responsible for. The range of faculty judgments was wide, from the ironically revealed competence indicated above, to the judgment made to me by another professor who had visited a Computer Science class at Illinois State University. Having seen what his peers were teaching those rather ordinary students, he told me that his own were not competent to do the same sort of assignments here.

Frankly, I do not know what is the truth behind these two contradictory comments. But it seems to me that the negative feeling displayed by the faculty towards entering New York City-educated high school students is something that the administrators of the Core Curriculum have to confront. What is most upsetting is that these judgments have been made by the very people who have volunteered for their assignments. It might be one thing if these observations derive from experience in selective courses -- Computer Programming, for instance -- that might impose obstacles on the local student coming from a deficient secondary school; it might be another if they derive from legitimate comparisons with students in rival institutions. And it might be another if it

smacks of an underlying hesitation to admit pedagogic possibilities to them. Student competence is a vital issue that should be debated, challenged, and substantiated by clearly defined measures of student progress and assessment. If the Core Curriculum is not reinforcing the academic standards that Brooklyn College has been noted for since my day, a review process of it is mandated.

The students I heard, of all ethnic and religious persuasions, discounted vociferously, in one way or another, the unsympathetic judgments they heard, or sensed, in their meetings with the faculty. All discounted their "exceptional" nature, which was the faculty's way of discriminating between our group of Peer Tutors and "les autres." All noted that their presence in the group resulted from simply doing well in one Core course -- "All I did was get an A," one exclaimed -- and revealing a "mentoring personality." I'm inclined to believe that the students are the great strength if, to take them at their word, they are a representative sampling. The mentors were honest, intelligent, loquacious, funny, gracious, and supportive of their crowd -- democratic and egalitarian in the best senses of those terms.

Open admissions, I was told, is a thing of the past. Brooklyn College is thus in an enviable position, for it now has the power to "make" its student body. That is to say, the College's success and its leadership position should enable it to control, or effect, substantially the upgrading of high school curriculums in the borough and beyond. The College, it seems to me, is now in a position to do more for the betterment of secondary education and

for the education of generations to come than professional seminars, Carnegie Foundation reports, Bennett diatribes, and summer institutes that, fairly or not, have littered our landscape. By stressing the way to success in the Core Curriculum, the College will be able to define cultural requirements and require curriculum revisions where they are needed most, and thus provide true direction from the top.

This advising aspect of the Core Curriculum needs to be improved. I was struck by the fact that, in one afternoon session I attended, not one of about a dozen faculty knew the regulations, requirements or language of the Handbook. Their ignorance makes immediate David Riesman's observation, that curriculums are "poor alternatives to good faculty advising." Your students need and deserve the best advisement available. It is a glaring lack, an oversight in a program that seems to have considered much beyond the obvious in its creation.

Preceding advising, I would offer another activity. In one way or another the entering student ought to be immediately, considerately, and forcefully apprised of the Core Curriculum. It does no good to respond that the Core Curriculum is made available to him/her as a high school senior, or that the "Introduction" to it is placed in his/her hands. Students read carelessly and listen indifferently. Life would be easier if, beginning with the freshman term,a pitch was made to them earnestly and with candor, about the Core Curriculum's objectives and expectations, its difficulties, successes and failures. This, together with admissions of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and the positive

assessments that can be made of it, should minimize some problems at the outset and jog the student into better programming of his/her Core courses.

Let not the above observations appear to diminish my great respect for the Brooklyn College faculty. No matter what the reasons for curriculum innovation, the faculty have a right to be proud of their flexibility, stature, and national achievement. The "encounter sessions" that I attended every afternoon, with their no-holds-barred discussions, divisions, disagreements and uncomplacent pleasures at recognized successes, could not be duplicated at any institution I am familiar with. Long may they and their mood of honest, searching inquiry prosper! Even if outside funding fails, if there is one activity that I see as vital, necessary, immediate, and indispensable to the sustained health and glory of Brooklyn College, it is its Faculty Development Seminars.

The issue, as I then see it, is not what courses are to be taught, and who teaches them, but the "proper" way to teach Core Curriculum courses. My notes indicate that there was no disagreement over a music course (2.2) or a culture course (9) or a course in a modern life science (7 and 8). There was agreement throughout about the excess of content in many courses, most strenuously in the debate following Professor Blumberg's presentation, "The Columbia University model [of science]."

I was bothered about a few things. The first was "relevance," and the manner in which a volatile and problematic term was brought out to justify problems of content. I would be happier with a

course in the history of physics, rather than the "politics" of physics; and I am not certain that knowing how to interpret "Consumers Reports" is a way of legitimating a semester in Cores 7 and 8. If the student is to be aware of the way science "impacts" upon our modern world, if he/she is to have a sense of environmental tensions that condition his/her life, if he/she is to be our ideal citizen functioning with intelligence and conviction in an ideal commonwealth, let him/her be apprised of his duties and responsibilities overall, but not in basic science courses. The great disciplines deserve more attention to themselves. And unless all the faculty are vociferously liberal and are profoundly shocked by the EPA, or OSHA, or the AEC, the "relevance" of science to living is sure to be compromised.

You have problems with modules and team-taught courses. The impression gained is that the latter are poorly related, uncertain of direction, and absent of coordination. Themes appear disjointed, disjunctive. The cultural relativity of Core 9 has, in the students' minds, become a miasma of educational relativity. Broad perspectives that seem "relevant" have undermined an attempt at unity. Much has been lost with the decision to have "each lecturer address his or her own area of special interest." More control needs to be asserted; more oversight intruded, even though I dislike any attempt to impose content on any lecturer. But it is necessary that the faculty arrange and organize their presentations, so as to integrate the mentalités of their respective subjects. Thus, while I found delightful the samplers from Core 9

presented by Professor Buncombe (English) and Professor Gordon (History), the former's discussion of family problems detailed in an African novel and the latter's pictorial reminiscences about his trips to India need a common focus/theme. I am aware that it is good to have a course's coherence result from a student's reflections following a course's activities; it is a straitjacket when it is applied from above. The solution would be a serious recognition that these courses truly demand linkage, integration, preparation, coherence.

Deliberately or not, many of the quotations from the Raskin and Owen report selected by the Planning Committee are beside the point. If they were not contradictory (see First Day (Afternoon) June 7, 1988), they were misserving education. That "only a small minority(!) of students had taken or intended to take a more advanced course in the same field as a Core course..." opts for quantity over quality. Dominant minorities, as Toynbee noted, make, sustain, direct, and lead cultures. If a "small minority" elected a course on "Greek Historians" or "Themes of Revolution: Russia, America, and France," following a core course, I would call the Curriculum a rousing success and congratulate the faculty. I am perceived in my institution as one of the "great teachers" in the Introductory Literature component, yet I have yet to see these Business, Computing, Economics, or Engineering majors flocking to advanced courses in Victorian Novels or Modern American Poetry.

Beyond these disparate and maybe idiosyncratic observations, I would like to conclude with more general comments that derive

from my excited participation in the Core Curriculum Project. One of the most important lessons that I have learned from the Brooklyn College experience/experiment is that each core program in every college is sui generis; and that the resurgent power of liberal education -- "what it takes to be an educated person in a technological society" -- is finally the responsibility of local teachers and scholars; and that the Harvard, Stanford, and Brooklyn College models are, thankfully, educational mirages or utopias for the rest of us. But Brooklyn College's tensions and discussions, its faculty's ebullience and independence, its almost anarchic renewals of commitment, as faculty and students ritualized the ongoing, never-ending and never-to-be-ended re-constructions and de-constructions of its Core Curriculum, have meaning for us all. Those of us who shared the Brooklyn College experience realize the burden that each of us bears, to be rededicated to the continued pursuit of intellect and excellence. Whether deliberate or not, the experience has taught us to be suspicious about any universal exclusiveness -- or even inclusiveness -- that attempts to resolve present-day debates over the "canon."

It appears to me that one sane conclusion to be drawn from the Faculty Development Seminar is that each of us must work out our own arrangements for educational reform. Neither the shrill cries of ministers of education nor the pacific overtures of Palo Alto should blind us to the true needs of our own students in their time and place. No single mode has been assigned unexamined leadership in Plato's great plan. The faculty of

Brooklyn College's Core Curriculum reveal that all education is truly progressive: not only must values be maintained but recognized barriers must be successively removed. Crisis and retrogression are givens of the experiment. The Brooklyn College faculty will continue to be disturbed by them, but the lesson they teach is that fair friends will always find ways to teach, and to sustain one another. Your faculty are not a representative faculty, and your students are only by a far stretch of the imagination representative of America's youth, but the lesson they teach is that men and women, using their reason and discipline honestly and zealously, can begin to solve their profession's reigning problems and at the same time contribute to the formation of a relatively good society.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0112

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH (703) 961-6501

Professor Ethyle R. Wolfe
Director of the Core Curriculum Project
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Dear Professor Wolfe:

I would like to provide you with a much overdue review of the Brooklyn College Vistors' Program in which I participated last June. My comments are not intended to be a detailed examination, but are rather constituted of general impressions. I ask that you forgive me for my tardiness.

Like the Core Curriculum of Brooklyn College itself, the Visitors's Program is an admirable model. Participating in the program was for me a professional and personal highpoint. The dedication and integrity of your own faculty and staff to what I believe are the true ends of a liberal arts education served to confirm for me the fact that there is no more important business for America's colleges and universities than to provide for undergraduate students a solid foundation in the major areas of academic inquiry.I admire your core-curriculum chiefly because it is interdisciplinary in the best sense--in the sense that we see the interconnectedness of the problems we face and their various and sometimes competing disciplinary solutions (a "worse" sense for me is "interdisciplinary" used to describe what is little more than a superficial "multi-media" approach, which has all the glitz and none of the heart of what is essential in liberal education.)

In my opinion your core is one of the best and most innovative programs in the country--in terms of both content and design. The visitor's program gave us the chance to appreciate many of its most the important features, including its faculty development component, which is exemplary. Most of your faculty seem to be highly motivated, serious, and sincere educators--I think that is because the core involves them in ways that appeal to their deepest academic values and highest educational aspirations. The results of the enthusiasm and loyalty engendered by being part of the core team are many and various: class presentations are taken very seriously; colleagues across departments really talk to one another.

I also appreciated learning more about your advising system, which seems to work well, meeting several of the peer tutors who took part in the workshops. The sense of community extends throughout the core as we saw in the faculty-student interaction.

A sense of community formed even among the participants in the Visitor's Program. I was delighted with the diversity of the group in terms of the institutions they represented and the diversity of their own academic backgrounds. Some of us work for large state supported universities, others for small liberal arts schools; some are scientists, others, like myself, humanists. Because we spent so much time together we were able to focus on the core. We explored educational issues with one another even as we travelled from our lodgings to the college, and after long and stimulating days in sessions, continued discussions on our return. We discussed the ways in which the core curricula at our own institutions related to one another and to Brooklyn's core.
I should like to mention a few specific things about the program itself beginning with the faculty worshops. The somewhat complicated rotations were very effective in some important ways: we did, for example, get to know quite a few members of your faculty this way. But on the other hand perhaps we moved around a bit too much. Maybe the answer is that we needed even more time, since the program was crammed full of very valuable material. I could not say that any of the individual workshops was not worthwhile. Most of the time the focuses of individual worshop sessions were clear; the groups well managed. The workshop leaders (most of them your own faculty) did a first-rate job, keeping spirits high and discourse rational. I'd like to single out for special commendation, Sherman van Solkema, who is an inspired academic, and you, who as Provost of the College, spoke openly and stirringly about founding and maintaining the core.

The lectures and class presentations were fascinating (one day we had very different, back-to-back presentations, one a slide show on India and Bangladesh, the other lower-key but very informative critical reading of an African novel).

All in all, I feel that the Visitor's Program was a tremendous success, and I am grateful for having had the chance to participate. Thank you once again, and best wishes on your retirement.

Sincerely yours,

A.J.Colaianne
Associate Professor of English
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

Appraisal of
Faculty Development Seminar
Core Curriculum Project
Brooklyn College

by

Robert J. Frankle
Memphis State University

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

The Faculty Development Seminar I attended from June 6 through 10 at Brooklyn College was likened by its organizers to a sandwich. It began and ended with a day's discussion among 12 visitors and approximately 6 Brooklyn faculty and administrators. In the intervening three days, we participated in the developmental seminar for Brooklyn College's own faculty. Since these three days formed the meat of the sandwich, let me begin with them.

From my visitor's perspective, these three days were far more valuable than all the canned presentations and articles I have been exposed to by institutions ballyhooing their new general education programs. One learned much more about both the potential and the problems of a core curriculum by "listening in" to a group of concerned and affected faculty discussing critical issues surrounding it, without such discussion being filtered for external consumption. I think Brooklyn College deserves enormous credit for both its openness and its courage in allowing 12 outsiders such an intimate view of its program, warts and all. In this regard, the ratio of 12 visitors to some 60 Brooklyn faculty seems about right. A larger proportion of visitors might inhibit discussion, at least to the extent of Brooklynites feeling obliged to explain their program to the visitors (which, in fact, did happen on days 1 and 5 of the seminar, the days of the outer loafs).

I thought each day's seminar was well structured, though sometimes tending to lag behind schedule (a typical academic failing). Student

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

participation was especially valuable and my sense was that the Brooklyn faculty also benefited from hearing student perceptions (though some tended to dismiss these particular students as atypical). The teaching samplers seemed a good idea, though a couple were a bit artificial, as they centered around discussion of a text which the rest of us had not read. (I wondered whether reading of the text could not be required beforehand. Or if that is not possible, then Prof. Wolfe's excellent use of excerpts as focus of discussion seems a promising approach).

On several occasions, the seminar broke down into smaller discussion groups, where key issues began to be systematically addressed. Yet I always came away from these groups feeling that the surface had just been scratched, that the discussion had been terminated too quickly, that they could have profitably used more time to explore the solutions that were beginning to be proposed. Notes were taken at each discussion group and I understand will be used by the Core Committee as it continues to address the problems raised in the seminar. But even if this does not happen, the very vitality of the seminar and discussions suggests that they will have a beneficial effect, if only in stimulating Brooklyn faculty to think together about the purpose of the core and their own teaching strategies to achieve this purpose. Indeed, I found myself wishing several times that such stimulating pedagogical discussions could take place on my campus.

One final reflection on the three day seminar. I could not help but notice the great impact made by the presentation of an alternative Science

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

course by Professor Roger Blumberg of Columbia University. This, I am sure, was due mainly to the high quality of his presentation. But still I was left wondering whether more external presentations might not be beneficial. For example, during my small group's discussion of writing, I was surprised by the naivete - at least by Brooklyn College standards - of many of the comments. Here was a case - or so it seemed to me - where the Brooklyn faculty could benefit from a presentation by a national authority on ways to incorporate writing across the curriculum.

The two days without the Brooklyn faculty - Monday and Friday - seemed less successful, probably because they were less focussed. The outline for these two days seemed promising, but was not followed strictly. The final session in particular meandered in and around the topic of assessment. The lack of direction made this the least successful day.

Part of the problem, I think, was that the Monday and Friday sessions equivocated between two valid goals - (1) preparation for, and refection upon, the Brooklyn faculty seminar and (2) sharing ideas and experiences about general education in a national context. These two goals are, of course, not incompatible, but without very careful planning the tension between the two can diffuse the discussion. Personally, I left on Friday with a feeling of lost opportunity - a regret that I had not learned very much about the General Education programs and experiences of the other institutions involved in the visitor's program. In this regard, I would like to endorse a suggestion made by one of my colleagues that the visitors write

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

a brief description of their institution's activities regarding general education and distribute this ahead of time. I also regret, in retrospect, my financially motivated decision to stay with relatives. Had I lodged in the same hotel as the other visitors, I might have come to know them, and their programs better.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38152

General Education

Having assessed the Development Seminar itself, let me step back and make some observation about the Core based on my Summer experience. Some of the discussion sounded quite familiar. The problem of non-English speaking graduate assistants, for example, is heard on most large campuses and Brooklyn seems no closer to solving it than the rest of us. Of greater interest, to me at least, was the issue of class size. While I am sure other factors were involved, I was struck, when reading the Raskin Evaluation Report, by the apparently close correlation between the perceived success of a core course and its size. The courses receiving the most criticism - 2.1, 7, 8, and 9 - also were those with the largest class size. Another theme with its counterpart on my campus is the tension between commonalty and individual autonomy. I suppose I was surprised to see this, since I had always associated Brooklyn in mind with emphasis on the common experience. Yet Core 9, for example, seemed to be taught in vastly different ways and most of the faculty seemed to be advocating more individual discretion, not less. On the other hand, one of the peer tutors complained to me over lunch that a couple of the instructors of Core 3 ignore the topic of gender, thought its syllabus seems to promise this will be included. How much diversity should be allowed in a core course thus seems a live, and unresolved, question at Brooklyn.

But while Brooklyn is still struggling with some of the problems that haunt the rest of us, it is remarkable how they seem to have solved - or escaped - conundrums that plague many schools, including mine. One is the conflict caused by increasing emphasis on research. Many faculty at Memphis

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

State have resented requests to work on developing new core courses, or putting more time into the teaching and grading of them, grumbling that they cannot afford to take time away from their research when there is so much pressure to publish. Yet when this issue was raised on Friday by Professor Schonhorn from Southern Illinois, those from Brooklyn seemed to have difficulty perceiving the problem. Evidently, their core was not achieved at the expense of research and scholarship. Yet one of its most impressive aspects is the obvious willingness of its faculty to devote lots of time, energy, and thought to discussing the core courses, as well as to teaching them.

But even more impressive - almost miraculous from my point of view - was the virtual absence of turfism. One faculty member did intimate to me over lunch that the core's construction was motivated partly by a desire to rescue a couple of "endangered" departments. But even he did not want to change the core. Indeed, everyone seemed to accept the basic structure of the core. Problems with some of the courses were certainly acknowledged and a number of solutions, some of them quite radical, were propounded. But none entailed replacing one department or discipline with another.

This, to me, represents the real achievement of the Brooklyn core. It has become a common source of pride for the faculty and a common catalyst for bringing faculty together to discuss common pedagogical problems and aims. This is quite a contrast from the typical body-snatching contest that marks most general education programs. From my perspective, that is the truly amazing feat.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

Our Lady of Holy Cross College
Innovators in Education Since 1916

4123 WOODLAND DRIVE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70131-7399 (504) 394-7744

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1988 JUN 27 AM 11: 10

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK
CORE SUMMER SEMINAR

Reverend Thomas E. Chambers, C.S.C., Ph.D.

Being a "Summer Associate" was a meaningful learning experience for many reasons which I shall give. The experience was a "process" of group development and positive growth, since the people invited were faculty, CORE faculty, administrators, and Summer Associates who interacted with ideas, suggestions, criticisms, but yet what brought them to such exchange was the "CORE Curriculum." Although an established agenda was in hand, the "hidden agenda" gave life and witness to an authentic exchange of opinions and insights. The learning climate was vibrant, interesting, but always with challenge.

The "presentations," "samplers," and discussions were open for response and clarification. People said what they wanted, and responded if the need was present. Professionalism was present and it was surrounded by friendliness; certainly, collegiality was occurring between all who were involved. There was a dynamic in place, though subtle; it was a cohesive factor bringing the membership to speak, think, reflect CORE. Our purpose of coming together was finding ways and means of examining a "curriculum" with a desire to improve.

It was obvious to me that complacency was not happening because the membership realized that to find better and more meaningful methods is a must. The "Process" reviewed strengths and attempted to analyze the weaknesses. Science was discussed, which, by the way, is an old age problem, but the discussion was an attempt to unify, strengthen and ultimately improve a specific concern. Agitation was not destructing the process, but rather giving the Seminar a new life towards what possibly can be.

The composition of the faculty was as diversified as the student body. Student CORE tutors, some only with a one year experience, gave their experience with appreciation. To think that such students could confidently stand before their faculty and then with excellent articulation, render a positive experience! These perceptions were most helpful and meaningful.

The entire "Faculty Development Seminar" had much content and it was a marvelous learning experience.

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
JUL 13 AM 11:25

To: Ethyle Wolfe, Provost, Brooklyn College
Carol Paul, Vice President, Suffolk Community College

From: Richard W. Fox, Professor of History RWF

Subject: Report on the Brooklyn College Faculty Development Seminar, June 6-10, 1988

Date: June 21, 1988

The Brooklyn College faculty development seminar described the origins and continuing evolution of the Brooklyn College core curriculum and demonstrated how the key to the success of that project has been the deep and broad based involvement of faculty and administration in teaching. For the Summer Associates, the essence of their seminar experience broke down into three major areas: the core process itself, which the visitors focused on in their own meetings and then directly experienced in plenary sessions with the Brooklyn faculty; an analysis of the critical issues that confront any core curriculum including definitions, the role of the faculty, and the impact of the core upon students; and finally, case studies of the operation of the core process that focused on the perceived weaknesses of core courses 9 (Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American Cultures) and 7-8 (Science in Modern Life) and on examples of actual classes called "samplers" that met specific objectives of the core such as writing across the curriculum and creating an impetus for lifelong learning. Summer Associates were able throughout the week to compare and contrast the Brooklyn experience with their own institutions.

The seminar provided the visitors with a three-step introduction to the core process. We first heard descriptions of the process from leading participants and followed up in small group discussions where we compared the Brooklyn experience with that of our respective institutions. Next, we joined Brooklyn faculty in actual summer workshops and became part of the core curriculum process at Brooklyn. Finally, we explored ways to assess and evaluate a new curriculum after implementation.

The most important lesson learned from this part of the seminar is that the essence of a core curriculum is process, not product; that the Brooklyn core is in a continual state of "becoming," a work in progress that is never complete; and that "an unexamined curriculum is not worth teaching" (Ethyle Wolfe). Key to the successful completion of the five stage core process described by Sherman Van Solkema is for a small group of faculty to share a common vision for general education and then slowly win over the bulk of the faculty through the drafting of very concrete models and course syllabi that give faculty discussions focus and direction. General statements of goals and objectives, somewhat surprisingly, were written at Brooklyn <u>after</u> course syllabi were developed and emerged from faculty discussions and workshops as a shared educational philosophy.

Extensive debate made clear that there were only a small number of potential curricular models and that a mixed model, combining a first tier of required courses and a second tier of distributional requirements that allow for a narrow range of student choice, was a viable alternative.

In addition to examining the core process, the summer seminar also encouraged Summer Associates to grapple with several critical issues raised by a core curriculum. A major question is how do you know whether a core curriculum, or any curriculum, is really being successful? In the final session, an important distinction was drawn between "assessment" and "evaluation." As Donald Cress from Northern Illinois University (and FIPSE) pointed out, assessment involves an attempt to quantify faculty performance and is almost always imposed by politicians and bureaucrats outside academia who distrust faculty and may themselves be anti-intellectual. Assessment is usually limited to only a portion of the cognitive domain, often only basic skills, excludes the affective domain completely, and relies on limited optical scanner test instruments. Instead of using these tests for diagnostic purposes, they are frequently given "sumative" uses in order to compare institutions and their relative merit for continued funding, clearly an improper use of the tests. The perverse logic of using a "value added" approach to outcomes evaluation assessment is clear when we consider that Miami Dade Community College would perform better than Harvard by this measurement. As President Hess of Brooklyn College pointed out, a "longitudinal statistical analysis" of Brooklyn's core curriculum gives a product that focuses on data and facts, not human qualities and, while it may reveal important information about student choices, it cannot offer an evaluation of the quality of a curriculum or of the articulated educational philosophy. In contrast, an evaluation design, according to Bruce Hofacker, should include assessment based on an analysis of student transcripts but should go on to examine student and faculty perceptions of the core through in-depth interviews. Nevertheless, there was general agreement that Brooklyn College had failed to devise means for compiling assessment data and a research design for evaluation when the core curriculum was first introduced and that it would indeed have been desirable to have done so.

Another important issues involved definitions: what does Brooklyn College really mean by a "core curriculum?" At Brooklyn a model core means a prescribed set of liberal arts courses taken by all students including non-liberal arts majors (just two non-liberal arts programs represent 54% of all students at Brooklyn). There is no provision for student choice in this general education requirement. Its purpose is not to prepare students for a particular major or profession but to broaden horizons and develop the mind. As a group, the core

courses should stress varying modes of inquiry as well as content, including definitive human achievements across a broad range of the liberal arts. In each course, stress is placed on the quality and depth of exposure rather than breadth of coverage.

The key advantages of this type of model core are "commonality" and "coherence." The "commonality" feature means all students share a common intellectual foundation, a common point of reference, and a common language that serves as the basis for sustained learning and rational discourse. "Coherence" means that there are integrative links between the individual core courses to indicate that knowledge must ultimately transcend the confines of single disciplines and counteract the narrowness of professional training. This is not to say that a core curriculum should present a monolithic, integrated, all-inclusive body of knowledge, but each core course needs to make connections with other core courses in order that the program as a whole makes sense to the student. The goal of a core curriculum is thus similar to the goal of general education as advanced in the Harvard Report of 1946: that there is a certain organic unity to knowledge, that students need preparation to act as free individuals and as citizens in society, not simply as doctors, engineers, business men, or accountants, and that the aim is mastery of life with wisdom the indispensable means to this end. A distributional curriculum is much less likely to embody this kind of "commonality" and "coherence" because of the great number and diversity of courses involved.

Another critical issue is that a core curriculum should be perceived as part of a continuum of student growth. A core can be effective only if students have already attained the college level skills demanded in a college curriculum. The Brooklyn core is further subdivided into two tiers with the emphasis in reading, writing, and interpretive skills in the five courses of Tier I serving as a foundation for more advanced work in the five courses of Tier II. The whole core concept recognizes that students mature through time and that skills developed in the core should be a starting point for specialization in a major and, hopefully, lifelong learning.

Perhaps the most critical issue for the successful implementation of a core curriculum is the need for active faculty involvement. The Brooklyn success is directly attributable to a small group of passionately involved faculty and administrators who possessed a vision and through countless hours of discussions and debates over several years inspired a consensus among the entire faculty for a new curricular design. Neither a small group of faculty nor the administration could have produced a substantive change on their own. In addition, Brooklyn developed vehicles for mobilizing faculty involvement that also helped

channel faculty energies. The core was initially created as an outgrowth of a college-wide faculty seminar meeting every evening for a week and open to all 800 faculty members. Summer seminars of fifty to seventy faculty meet several days each summer to examine particular aspects of the core. They include faculty from departments that do not teach core courses as well as counsellors and students. A visitor's program also produced a steady stream of non-Brooklyn faculty from across the country whose comments and perspectives greatly strengthened Brooklyn's core program.

In the end, it was also the faculty that benefited most from the core. For those who invested their time, energy, and creativity, there were tremendous rewards in terms of improved collegiality (faculty from different departments got to know one another and exchanged ideas across disciplines for the first time), a renewed interest in the art of good teaching, and much greater sensitivity to the needs of the new type of student entering colleges in the 1980's. In the advanced courses of their specialties, faculty have also relied on the core and can build upon what all students have studied in common. There is no need to keep teaching introductory courses even at the advanced level (as often occurs with a distributional model) because with a core student learning is cumulative, not scattered and impressionistic.

Nor can the students be ignored. Although it is not for the students to decide whether there should be a core and in what areas, student perceptions are important, and the issues they raise must be addressed. In the beginning, students tend to see the core as a forbidding monolith but after completing the ten courses they gain a great sense of accomplishment. At Brooklyn, a student survey showed 51% of those questioned believed that students should <u>not</u> have a choice in selecting courses to satisfy general education requirements. Student complaints about particular core courses have led to syllabus changes and summer workshops. Students still have difficulty with the demanding texts and extensive writing assignments in all ten core courses which have been partially met by a peer-tutoring system and a new faculty-student mentor program. Nevertheless, there are still difficulties. The CUNY writing assessment required of all students does not accurately reflect the demands of the core courses, and there is the perennial problem of getting the weaker students (instead of the top students) to take advantage of peer tutors and faculty mentors. As Sherman Van Solkema said, no student should be allowed to remain mute for an entire semester.

One last major issue was dealt with briefly: Brooklyn found it impossible for practical and administrative reasons to design a core around an explicit theme or to make all core courses interdisciplinary. Most core courses are taught solely by members of one department from the perspective of a single discipline.*

The third and last phase of the seminar was an analysis by all eighty-five participants of Core 9 (Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American Cultures) and Core 7-8 (Science in Modern Life) which provided the Summer Associates with case studies of Brooklyn's core process. Individual faculty presented sample classes in the plenary sessions after which participants were broken up into small workshops to discuss particular issues and to return with concrete recommendations for further discussion and comment by the entire group. These efforts appeared to produce a consensus for important changes in Core 9. Core 7-8 remains a problem; the science faculty does not yet appear to have succeeded in creating genuine core courses, only half-semester mini-courses in physics, chemistry, biology, and geology.

Core 9 attempts to make students appreciate cultures other than their own, and its structure is unique. The course is <u>team-taught</u> by three faculty from each of the area studies covered, it is <u>modular</u> with the course broken up into segments on Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and it is <u>multi-disciplinary</u> in that history, literature, or art may be the focal point of a module. The challenge of Core 9 is that liberal learning must be made global, and its

*The term "interdisciplinary" can cause confusion because of its many meanings. At one extreme, an interdisciplinary course is one that is team-taught by members of different disciplines who seek to break down the boundaries between their specialties in order to create a synthesis. A weaker version of the term applies to courses that are not team-taught but synthesize several disciplines. This type of course may be taught by a faculty member from any of the disciplines involved. Finally, at the other extreme, an interdisciplinary course can be one that is taught by one faculty member from any of several disciplines, but the course design does not require a synthesis of material from more than one of the several disciplines that teach the course. In addition, an entire curriculum, not just a course, may be considered interdisciplinary if it is designed around an explicitly interdisciplinary theme or if all or most of its courses are interdisciplinary in any of the three senses given above. The Brooklyn curriculum is not interdisciplinary in any of these ways, although two core courses, Core 9 (described below) and Core 3 (People, Power, and Politics) are interdisciplinary in the first and second sense respectively.

success can be measured in a student survey which reports three-quarters of those surveyed felt increased respect for people of different backgrounds. The fallacy of Core 9, however, has been to put in the same classroom three different teachers from three different macro-regions using three different methods of analysis and to assume that because the teachers are doing what they do best, a cohesive and comprehensible course will result. What should be common to all three modules? How do you keep the students from being overwhelmed? Core 9 illustrates the formidable obstacles to any course that seeks to do justice to the diversity of world cultures. Still, it is clear that students will benefit from at least one team-teaching experience.

Core 7-8 is too frequently bogged down in a multitude of detail and suffers from too rapid coverage of too many topics. The science core needs to focus on basic principles, intellectual imagination, and the nature of science generally in order for students to make connections with other liberal arts courses and between science and their own lives. Many science core classes are not carrying out the principles of the core curriculum as indicated by non-science faculty visitations to science lectures. These faculty observed students talking and eating during class, walking in and out, and generally displaying total passivity to the learning process. There were several suggestions on how to make the science core not just mastery of a collection of facts but understanding the scientific way of knowing. Presentations were made by Roger Blumberg describing the innovative Columbia University science model and by Brian Schwarz explaining a thematic approach to the teaching of science to non-majors which stresses the unity of science and its great importance into the lives of everyone.

In conclusion, the final question is what are the lessons of the Brooklyn core experience for Suffolk Community College? At first glance it would appear that a large, selective four year institution with a distinguished list of faculty publications has little in common with a two year, multi-campus community college. Indeed, Suffolk's faculty does not have the specialists to teach Core I on the classical world or Core 9 on the non-western world on a college-wide scale. Still, there is much in the Brooklyn experience that can be instructive for Suffolk. We share common pedogogical concerns, and the process utilized by Brooklyn for dealing with these concerns has universal validity. Both institutions face the need to maintain enrollments with underprepared students who do not often share a common culture with the faculty. Both institutions need to offer a curriculum with some coherence that students can comprehend and find meaning in and that faculty can be committed to. Both need to revitalize a faculty with a large percentage of senior professors. In both colleges, moreover, the process of curricular formulation needs to be based in

the faculty because only the faculty can generate a consensus on educational goals and educational philosophy and work to realize those goals in the classroom. Programs will remain superficial catalog statements without large scale faculty involvement and without hard work on the actual syllabi and bibliographies necessary to build consensus and commitment throughout the institution. In this area, Brooklyn College is clearly different from Suffolk but worthy of emulation. Widespread faculty participation in curricular reform will likely create a better design and promote faculty development as well. A dynamic process of on-going curricular development is needed to identify and continually refine a common body of learning appropriate for our students. This process must be institutionalized as a permanent part of the teaching enterprise. The impressive collegiality and sense of renewal so evident at Brooklyn College is in large measure due to faculty involvement in the core curricular process.

RWF/st

cc: Dean Canniff
Members of the Western Campus General Studies Committee

Patricia Silber
Marymount College
Tarrytown, NY

Brooklyn College
Faculty Development Seminar
June 6-10, 1988

While my participation as a summer associate in the Faculty Development Seminar yielded many valuable practical suggestions to enrich the Humanities Program at Marymount College, my most rewarding experiences were less tangible: sensing the strength of collegiality among faculty, both Core and non-Core, peer tutors, and visitors: the openness to discussion and subsequent change: the college-wide enthusiasm and concern for the Core.

I admired the frequently reiterated view of all participants that the Core is a work in progress that calls for continuing experimentation. Also enlightening was the distinction made between purpose and content of Core courses and those of a discipline's introductory courses. And, of course, those key terms empowerment, connections, and commonality pointed to shared goals of the highest quality.

What follows are reflections on specific activities and assertions.

1. The comments of the poised and articulate peer tutors were especially valuable as indicators of student response to the Core. The generally favorable findings of Raskin and Owens on student attitudes were emphatically confirmed by the peer tutors, both in their thoughtful assessments of the courses with which they work and in their explanation of reactions of fellow students and those they tutor. Their advocacy of diagnostic testing, surprise quizzes, and essay exams showed a mature approach to their Core courses.

2. I was pleased to learn of the seriousness with which the College takes writing across the Core. However, at the workshop in which I participated, on writing in the sciences, a questionable assumption was especially apparent: scientists do not write, or at least not in the same sense as do humanists. Biology Professor Norman Levin argued strongly against this perception, as did Professor Jerome Megna and this writer. Since Roger Blumberg's model relies heavily on the use of scientific papers to teach non-scientists, and Brian Schwartz proposes team teaching by a scientist and a humanist, there is some irony in the expressed belief of workshop participants that a qualitative difference exists between writing done by scientists and by non-scientists. I found Professor Levin's insistence that observations written in lab reports amount to much more than filling in the blanks convincing, and was impressed by his refusal to give multiple-choice exams.

In a related matter, David Seidemann's assertion that a scientist in one discipline can handle a Core course that provides instruction and insight into other science disciplines was a useful reminder of the Core's purpose: to provide, as someone remarked, the ability to read with pleasure half of the articles in the Tuesday science pages of the New York Times. Most important, scientists and humanists discussed these questions openly and without rancor, further evidence of collegiality.

3. Although the problems of Core 9 are familiar to anyone concerned with a course aiming to introduce students to other cultures (See Stanley N. Kurtz's letter to the New York Times 6/23/88), the model for the course is sound, exposing students as it does to a multi-disciplinary approach. The problems discussed were in the execution, particularly in staffing. It can never be easy to find

three faculty members available for a team-taught course; because the coordinator must work within the requirements of several departments, this problem will persist. Nevertheless, the suggestions made in my workshop held promise that would repay attempting them: thematic or values-centered approaches, experimental one-teacher sections, concentration on language as a shaper of culture.

4. Sampler presentations demonstrated more than pedagogical strategies. They pointed the way for students to integrate knowledge gained in specific Core courses with the rest of the Core and with the rest of their baccalaureate experience, leading them to make the all-important connections that are a key goal of the Core. It may be significant that the most informative of the samples, those of Professors Buncombe, Michael, and Wolfe, were presented with little audio-visual assistance. Because of my own weakness in math, I was disappointed that technical problems made it difficult to appreciate Professor Gerson Levin's fascinating demonstration.

5. The question of how successfully Core courses led to further electives in liberal arts narrowed, in my workshop, to counting how many students took further courses in a specified discipline. This might more profitably have addressed the task described in the program as "the Core as a starting point for life-long learning."

As I look over these notes, I find that I, whose discipline is English literature, have dealt at some length with science. This is probably because I am distressed, at my own institution and elsewhere, to see humanities and sciences so often divided into opposing camps. It was refreshing to experience during this seminar at least a partial toppling of the barrier between

the two.

For this, and for all of the above reasons, especially its dedication to faculty development, I left the seminar with a genuine appreciation of the Brooklyn College Core Curriculum and the continuing efforts by everyone involved to make it more effective. I am grateful for having had the chance to participate and inspired by all I learned as a participant.

COMMENTS ON THE SUMMER ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
BROOKLYN COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM PROJECT

Bettie M. Smolansky
Moravian College

Participation as a Summer Associate in the 1988 Brooklyn College Core Curriculum Project Faculty Development Seminar was for me a rewarding experience, both personally and professionally. Indeed, it was an intensive set of experiences, so diverse that I have found it impossible to develop a nice, coherent framework for my evaluative comments.

Therefore, I have decided simply to list a series of numbered comments/suggestions on a range of topics:

1. The initial sessions with your summer associates would probably be more productive if each of them were asked to submit a brief description of his/her home institution and its general education program several weeks prior to the beginning of the workshop. (A statement of each's expectations and "needs" might also be useful to those planning the workshop.) These could be duplicated and sent to all participants so they could familiarize themselves with this background information in advance.

2. The Core Booklet which was shared with all workshop participants is due for an update. (Again, an advance copy of such a document would be helpful to Summer Associates.) The process of producing this revised version may well prove to be a salutary one for the Core Committee, for it will require them to think anew about the core's goals and objectives, as well as its way and means. A practical suggestion vis-a-vis such a booklet also comes readily to mind; i.e., since detailed, syllabus-style course outlines almost always suffer from rapid obsolescense they should be included only in a readily replaceable appendix.

3. Two features of the current workshop stand out in my mind as deserving of comment:

   a. The Core Samplers -- while I enjoyed most of the samplers offered at this workshop very much as intellectual experiences, I am not persuaded that they are the most time-effective mechanism for stimulating serious thinking about the pedagogy or appropriate content of the core. Both the small group workshops and the pedagogically-focused presentations (such as those on teaching science) seemed to me to be superior for this purpose. I would especially urge the provision of slightly more time for small group sessions. The groups of which I was a part always seemed to have difficulty concluding the task(s) assigned in the time allowed.

   b. By all means do continue to include your peer tutors as both presenters and full-scale participants in your workshops. They

never failed to inject a laudable note of practical reality into our discussions, a tone which academics assembled are want to lose if left to their own devices.

4. I understand the frustrations that have led your science faculty to reorganize the Science half courses so that they will run for 14 rather than 7 weeks. However, based on experience at my own institution (where full courses are four-credit courses) with what we had labelled half courses, I would caution that strict oversight be exercised lest they become full courses. Though the classroom time will be only half that of "full" science courses, professors have a way of incrementally augmenting the amount of out-of-class work that they expect of students in such circumstances. (If they are being candid, most faculty will admit that the coverage quantity and/or demand level of 5 or 6 week summer courses is probably not completely the equal of the same course offered during a regular semester; the object lesson for the reverse situation is clear enough.)

5. A key concern at this point in its history (especially now that the long-awaited Raskin and Owen Report has been published) is on-going evaluation and assessment. Since some of my own scholarly preparation is in this field, I will hazard some relevant comments and suggestions.

   First, it is well to keep in mind that evaluation studies generally are of one of two types: summative or formative. The former attempts to assess the adequacy of a program with some relative or absolute standards (at least implicit) against which outcomes are measured. The latter focuses instead upon process, and its ultimate objective is not to "grade" but to help improve a program. Unfortunately, most of the standard approaches which serve the one of these purposes well are poor for the other.

   Therefore, I would recommend a kind of hybrid approach which combines the attention to sampling procedures that characterizes the typical summative survey and the focus on process which typifies formative studies. In practical terms, you should choose a demographically diverse (in terms of age, sex, race, ethnicity, and measured ability level), small sample of recent graduates who have completed the core and compare them with a comparable sample from student cohorts that graduated just before the core was introduced. Both groups should be subjected to what are known as focused interviews revolving partially around such perceptual questions as the following:

   a) What was your best educational experience at Brooklyn College? Your worst? (& why?)

   b) What should the college have done more of for you? (Less?)

   c) What should we have required you to do more of for yourself?

   These should then be augmented by a follow-up emphasis on more behaviorally focused questions such as these:

a) In what ways do you spend your leisure? (with follow-up probes for frequency and duration of such activities)

b) What kind of (and how much) reading do you do beyond that which is specifically required by your job/occupation?

Then conclude with some summative self-evaluation questions such as these:

a) How well (or poorly) has your college education prepared you for your career?

b) In what way has your college education impacted on your life apart from your career?

These are only sample, suggested questions, and people with specific expertise in interviewing from your own faculty/staff should be asked to give the matter careful thought. The cost per respondent of this kind of approach will be higher than the kind of standardized questionnaire approach apparently used in the Raskin and Owen study, but you should be able to generate more useful (in the formative sense) information from a much smaller sample. Moreover, training and <u>using</u> a group of graduate students in the social/behavioral sciences as your interviewers could also help cut costs and at the same time would provide those students with both some financial support and a valuable professional experience.

6. <u>A final, general comment</u>: As a visitor, I especially appreciated both the <u>collegiality</u> and the <u>candor</u> of the participating Brooklyn College faculty, staff, and students. We were treated to a "warts and all" view of Brooklyn's Core. Since the 1988 Faculty Development Seminar was focused primarily upon what are seen as major problem areas in the Core, this was perhaps inevitable. Even so, however, this observer (a faculty member for almost 25 years) was especially impressed by the openness with which problems were discussed and the pervasive positive spirit which most participants brought to the process. Even strongly-held, candidly-expressed conflicting views did not destroy the general spirit of collegiality.

And that brings me to my last point: Whatever its effect on your students has been and will continue to be, in my view, the most important <u>direct</u> effect of the Brooklyn Core Program has been on the College's faculty. In creating a Core Program you have provided for the creation of a cadre of faculty for whom the liberal education of your students is a key concern. In the process, you have reinvigorated not only Brooklyn College's institutional image, both internally and externally, but you have liberated some of your best teachers from the sometimes intellectually stifling disciplinary concerns which typically dominate our professional lives within collegiate departments. When Provost Wolfe suggested "Dead wood makes the best kindling," I believe it was this aspect of the process to which she was implicitly referring.

WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
OF NEBRASKA

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1988 JUL 11 AM 11:34

When I first visited Brooklyn College in the fall of 1986 I was both excited about and awed by the success of the Core Curriculum. In the fall of 1986 I thought it almost miraculous that Brooklyn College had a faculty so willing to adopt a core curriculum and to follow through on their obligation to make the core coherent. I thought the faculty must be extraordinary; unlike faculty at my or any other institution, they seemed amazingly ready to give up turf, to abandon traditional and disciplinary approaches, and to embrace the core concept.

When I returned during the week of June 6, 1988 I was even more excited and awed. This time, however, I realized that the Brooklyn College faculty are, indeed, like faculty at my institution and elsewhere. In fact, as I sat through the sessions, the positions fervently held, indeed, even the words used to express those positions were strikingly, almost frighteningly, similar to those I have heard at my present institution and other institutions where I have worked. This revelation of the worm in the garden is a source of hope. Brooklyn College is the real world; it has real life faculty members. But it implemented and is sustaining a core curriculum--other institutions have some hope of reform. I realize, too, that the reform was not a miracle but the result of the dedication and work of one or two key people--an apparently unbeatable team of Ethyle Wolfe and Sherman Van Solkema. I remain convinced that no such sweeping reform could have taken place without the intense commitment of an administrator who had the clout to support the program financially and a faculty member who was attuned both to the administrative and faculty issues in evoking reform. Faculty members have now assumed more responsibility for leadership and the programs will thus continue.

Perceptions of Faculty Seminars

In one of the workshops the discussion focused on what distinguishes core courses from other introductory courses. In addition to citing the characteristics of the core courses listed on page 6 of THE CORE CURRICULUM, faculty pointed out that core courses may be interdisciplinary, disciplinary, or team taught. Above all, they said coherence is the key concept and the major contributing factor in the success of the core. They also readily agreed that dedication to the principle of "covering the territory" is a major contributing factor to the failure of core courses. Obviously, both the organizers of and the participants in the faculty seminar were well aware that the lack of success of the cores in world cultures, sciences, and art/music stemmed at least partially from a lack of coherence. Thus, the focus of the seminar was precise and the organization right on target.

Core 9

At the risk of stating the obvious, I offer the following observations: A key issue in this core seems to be that of departments' lack of commitment to the core and to the organization of the course. Given the assumption that faculty are free to choose areas they are interested in and thus have a real incentive to participate in Core 9, logistics seem to be a major issue and that is a department chair problem. Someone, whether it is the chair of the department or of the Faculty Council Committee, must take responsibility for choosing faculty (perhaps even having a contingency plan in the case of resignations, etc.) and for establishing an organizational meeting of the faculty participants--preferably before the academic term begins. This appears to be an extremely simple remedy--but in the workshop I attended, faculty participants said it had not happened, with the result, of course, that in some instances texts had not been chosen or agreed upon before the opening session. Faculty must meet together before the academic year begins to map out the course--to establish some common themes, to agree upon texts, to set up exam dates and concepts to be covered, and to provide some transitions between segments of the course.

At two different institutions, I have experimented with interdisciplinary, team-taught courses as well as modular courses. In both instances, the modular approach was more successful. First the team-taught course is an expensive route, calling for an administrative commitment year after year. Second, in their evaluations students frequently stated that faculty seemed to be more intent on talking to and for each other than to students. The modular approach is not as expensive, can be well organized (simply because on the surface it is so apparent that it must be), and students (particularly students of the 80's) respond well to overt structure.

Perhaps three faculty members could be responsible for three sections of the core course, participate in all three on a rotation basis but receive credit for one course. That is, they would teach a total of fifteen weeks but in three different sections for five weeks each. This approach would mean the faculty member responsible for the first five weeks would schedule a meeting with the faculty member responsbile for the second five weeks, etc. The difficulty in the current approach seems to be that students are overwhelmed by adjusting to three different personalities addressing three different cultures from, in some instances, three different disciplines. A structure that demands that faculty meet together periodically outside of class will help continuity. As suggested in the seminar, a thematic approach will also help. Perhaps faculty could focus on those aspects of human life that are commonly shared, choosing a theme of work, family, and religion.

Core 7

The difficulties in the science core appear more complex than the problems in the other cores. First, the question of the relationship of the number and kind of details or facts (which must be memorized) to broad concepts seems more pressing than in the other core courses. This question is compounded by two factors: a) the vast number of details/facts and b) a majority of the science faculty at the seminar seemed to think that many of those details or facts are essential to understanding broad concepts. The science faculty objected to a course that focuses only on current issues or crises in science and society because it may not prepare students to think about the next crisis in science and life. Secondly, the labs compound the problem in the course because they raise a whole series of questions and, in effect, are taught by a second, parallel, faculty--the lab assistants.

In response to the first set of issues, only the members of the science faculty at Brooklyn College can ultimately determine what students must know. My impression is that many members of the science faculty have not confronted the question of what they want students to know, given the parameters of the core concept. Obviously, they need to answer the question and then proceed to organize a course. One positive suggestion made in our workshop was for Chemistry/Biology and Physics/Geology to be taught together. If science faculty think that will work, chances are it will, if for no other reason than the fact that they suggested it and thus must be somewhat committed to it. With the exception of the geology and physics faculty members, it does not appear that many science faculty members are committed to the current approach.

With regard to the issue of the labs, the core obviously has a problem if students make statements such as "I do not have one good thing to say about the labs" or "I didn't know why we were playing with the tinker toys." Two issues must be addressed. First, what is the function of the labs (why do science faculty members want students in a lab—to learn about the wonders of discovery? to learn new concepts? to study in depth or at first hand the concepts learned in the lectures? to learn about the scientific method? to learn about the subjective nature of scientific research?)? Secondly, in those instances (such as geology) where the faculty had a clear idea about the reason for the labs and even had a clear set of projects for students to focus on, the purpose was lost in translation (so to speak). As I suggested in the plenary, the science faculty might wish to make a week of training mandatory for lab assistants. During that week, the lab assistants would not only have a copy of the course outline and discuss the concepts to be covered during the term but also would have some basic instruction in pedagogy. I would add that the labs could provide an excellent opportunity for some experiments in writing across the curriculum. Scientific writing, with its demand for clarity, precision, and thoroughness is a "natural" for talking about writing and its connection to critical thinking and clarity of expression—it also provides a natural forum for discussion of style and such matters as the use of the passive voice and even of the question of why much contemporary scientific writing relies so heavily on simple and compound sentences.

Core 2

The workshop I attended focused on the core course in music. If the music core is not as successful as some of the other cores, it may be because the course attempts to cover too much territory (a list of eight goals/objectives/concepts appears on the course outline). In addition, the course appears to share the science core's problem of having assignments whose objective or raison d'etre have been lost. For example, the student in our workshop said the listening and writing assignments were not taken seriously by students and were seen as "hoops they had to jump through." The first problem can be addressed by having music faculty determine, bottom line, what is important to students, given the parameters of time, etc. The second problem can be addressed by having music faculty meet with members of the writing center (or English Department) to discuss methods of improving the writing assignments. Music faculty might be reminded, for example, that every piece of writing does not need a grade. Students might be asked to keep a

ATTACHMENT F

The Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College
1987-88 FIPSE PROJECT

PROVOST'S SEMINAR
FOR
THE RENEWAL OF LIBERAL LEARNING

Spring Semester 1988

I. INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS

1. Definition(s) of the Term "Liberal Learning"

A) Relationship to the term "General Education"
B) Relationship to the term "Core Curriculum"
C) Relationship of "Basic Skills" competency and courses to the definition(s)
D) Development of a consensus on the definition of "Liberal Learning" for purposes of the seminar

(Cf. The Harvard 1946 Redbook, General Education in a Free Society) and Kimball's 1986 Ness-award book, History of Liberal Arts Education)

2. Case for Renewal of Liberal Learning in the Baccalaureate Curriculum

A) Current state of liberal learning in American undergraduate colleges
B) Identification of nature of the need (if any) for renewal of liberal learning in the curriculum of participants' institutions

(Cf. Boyer's 1987 College: The Undergraduate Experience in America and Bloom's 1987 The Closing of the American Mind)

II. CURRICULUM DESIGN AND CONTENT

1. Design of Liberal Studies Curriculum

A) Common-experience core and the questions it raises

a) Is it true to say that the knowledge explosion has put American higher education beyond the point at which common intellectual experience is possible or even desirable?
b) What can be said about the relation of a common-experience core to the renewal of liberal learning?
c) How do common-experience models differ, when they do, from 40's-and 50's-style college-wide requirements?
d) What are the benefits and limitations of a common-experience curriculum?

B) Curricular diversity through distribution requirements

a) What is the relationship of distribution requirements to the renewal of liberal learning?

b) What are the benefits and limitations of distribution requirements?

C) What is the relation of institutional mission and tradition to the choice of curriculum design?

2. Content of a Liberal Studies Curriculum

A) For a common experience core
B) For distribution requirements
C) For alternative models
D) General criteria for selection

a) How can an intellectual and pedagogic order in the selection of content areas and texts be established?
b) What content can best improve basic skills?
c) What content can best integrate the habits of inquiry and liberal learning?
d) What general selection criteria are feasible? Applicable to the Humanities? The Sciences? The Social Sciences? The Arts?
e) Are there alternative criteria along non-traditional and non-divisional lines?

(Cf. National Endowment for the Humanities 1984 To Reclaim a Legacy and Association of American Colleges 1985 Integrity in the College Curriculum)

3. Coherence as a Desideratum in Baccalaureate Education

A) Is a structured curriculum ipso facto a coherent program?
B) How does design affect focus on central coherence questions?
C) What impact should a common-experience core have on the structure and content of undergraduate disciplinary majors? On programs for improving basic skills? On electives for non-majors?
D) Is a coherent general education an a priori virtue?

(Cf. Brooklyn College's Core Curriculum booklet)

III. PROCESS FOR RENEWAL OF LIBERAL LEARNING

1. Process for Creating a Curriculum

A) Developing faculty interest in change

a) How can faculty leadership and willingness to engage in institutional discussion of general education issues be generated?
b) What process for developing consensus is most effective?
c) What role is there for academic administrators' participation in discussion of program design and in assessment of budgetary and staffing implications?

B) Insuring faculty commitment

a) How can faculty involvement in the creation process be enlarged and sustained?
b) What governance and support mechanisms can contribute to commitment to overcome obstacles and see the task through?

2. Process For Implementation and Ongoing Review and Revision Of a Curriculum (based on experience of seminar associates)

A) Faculty development activities-issues of pedagogy and research

a) How can active learning be generated?
b) How can students be transformed into collaborative inquirers and critical thinkers?
c) What are the best means of promoting the continuing vitality of core studies offerings in the classroom? Of encouraging on-going refinement of individual courses? Of promoting cross-interdisciplinary discourse among core faculty? Of promoting coherence of the program through integration of the courses?
d) Will the experience of developing common-experience liberal arts curricula lead specialists to invent new modes of inquiry that have implications for rethinking courses in their disciplines and for their research?

B) Assessment of impact

a) On students
b) On faculty
c) On the design and curriculum of the major
d) On electives
e) On learning beyond the classroom and the baccalaureate years What institutional support programs geared to the curriculum's content can be developed to extend its intellectual impact beyond the classroom? In a commuter institution? In a residential college? In a large metropolitan area?

C) Process for evaluation and reconsideration of a program

a) What adaptations of existing methodologies are especially relevant for studying the effectiveness of core curricula in liberal arts colleges?
b) What mechanisms for introducing revision and change are there for insuring the vitality of the program, both for students and faculty?

(Cf. The Association of American Colleges 1988 Task Group Report, A New Vitality In General Education)

IV. REPRISE: SEMINAR DEFINITION OF THE TERM "LIBERAL LEARNING"

Report on the Associates-in-Residence Program and the Summer Associates Program

Introduction

Brooklyn College describes its Core Program thus:

> Its goal is to provide equal exposure for all students to a common intellectual experience and a uniform foundation on which to build their preparation both for careers and for fuller lives. All students are now required to complete a program of ten new interrelated core courses, structured into progressive tiers and combining the best of traditional learning with the newest knowledge and methodologies ... The task, after adoption, was and still is to translate plans and commitment into teaching effectiveness and ten courses into a coherent and progressive whole which would so interrelate the courses that the unity and purpose of the core would be perceptible and meaningful to all students.

Faculty and administrators around the nation (and even outside the U.S.) have continued to ask: How did they do it? Can we do it? Did they have unlimited financial resources? How did they get the faculty in a sufficiently good mode? How do they keep the faculty interested in the core? As an initial response to questions such as these, Brooklyn College developed its highly successful Visitors Program.

This program has enabled over two hundred colleagues to participate in nine two-day programs which provided Visitors with a brief overview of the content of the Core Program itself; the history of its creation, gradual implementation, and ongoing cultivation; the initiatives in place to support the Core Program: e.g., Faculty Development Seminars, the Standing Committee on the Core, the Core Course Coordinators, the writing-across-the-Core program, the Core Faculty Writing Workshops, the College Writing Center, Fundamental Texts Discussions, the Core Sampler, Collegewide Faculty Seminars on the Core, and Individual Core Course Seminars.

These latter initiatives are referred to as the "core process." But in a way, even these are a part of the anatomy of the Core program. The real "life" of the program, the real "process" is the earnest (and sometimes heated) sharing of viewpoints and concerns by members of the Brooklyn College community. This is perhaps the most important component of the Core Program. This is what Visitors can take home with them. It can be done; it actually is possible for faculty members to deliberate and even agree on "what knowledge is most worth having." But what is important is not so much <u>what</u> faculty and administration of other institutions eventually agree on; rather it is <u>that</u> they engage in the process of serious corporate thinking about the curriculum. This is absolutely critical to curricular change.

Clearly, a key component of the core process at Brooklyn College has come to be the cross-fertilization among Brooklyn College and outside faculty made possible by the Visitors Program. Brooklyn College faculty, in all their diversity of disciplines and pedagogical viewpoints, show Visitors that "it can be done." Visitors tell Brooklyn College faculty that Brooklyn College has indeed accomplished a great deal and has much to be proud of, despite disappointments about this or that aspect of the Core. Moreover, Visitors from a wide variety of home institutions are able to find common ground for discussion among themselves. Such initiatives are clearly beneficial both to Brooklyn College faculty and to visiting colleagues from other institutions. As the Provost of Brooklyn College has remarked:

> The payoff has been that we have reaped the unexpected benefit of new perspectives from disinterested observers as we have shared with them

> our outstanding problems and sought to help them find solutions to conceived obstacles in the way of introducing or implementing core programs on their campuses ... There is no doubt in my mind that interinstitutional dialogue is a valuable and revitalizing antidote to frustration, inbreeding, burnout, and of priceless mutual benefit to those of us in higher education.

However, Brooklyn College does not expect or hope that Visitors will attempt to import wholesale the content of its Core Program to the Visitor's home institution. Brooklyn College is the first to admit that this could well be a big mistake. What is essential is for faculty and administration at each institution to deliberate long and hard on its own aspirations, its own culture, its own possibilities, and its own understanding of liberal learning. Even an institution for which the particular content of the Brooklyn College Core Program might happen to be perfectly suited would be ill served if campuswide discussion and deliberation were to have been short-circuited. Institutional introspection and self-understanding are absolutely critical; each institution must do it for itself, and that takes time. What is essential to see and experience at Brooklyn College is the process: the attentive listening, the concerned and principled discussion--over a prolonged period of time. Thus Brooklyn College holds that it is not the result but the process that is duplicable elsewhere. The two-tier system, the set of ten core courses, etc., work for Brooklyn College; but each school must think for itself, reflecting on its own culture, aspirations, possibilities and constraints.

At Brooklyn College, faculty were not "put in a good mood" first; nor were there unlimited resources (in fact, at the time of the creation of the Core Program, Brooklyn College faculty members had every reason not to be in a good mood, and precisely because of the precariousness of the funding

picture). This is an extremely valuable lesson for Visitors to take from Brooklyn College: one need not wait until conditions are ideal (happy, energetic faculty; lots of money) before doing anything--such moments never occur anyway. This is one of the most important things the core process at Brooklyn College can teach other institutions. Again, it is essential to keep in mind the distinction between the core process and the core product. Each school must go through the steps of producing a curriculum suitable to it. Curricular reform is nothing if not a faculty development initiative.

The time never will be perfect for establishing a core program. Brooklyn College offers no magic show, nor is it the holder of alchemical secrets for turning faculty alienation and resistance into enthusiasm and commitment. The only magic at Brooklyn College is the magic of solid faculty commitment and strongly supportive administrative leadership. This is a program that began to work because people wanted it to work; it keeps working because people continue wanting it to work.

A great many of the "alumni" of the Visitors Program seem to have caught on to the idea of the core process but realized that one does not fully grasp such a phenomenon in merely two days. Not surprisingly, these "alumni" expressed a desire to see Brooklyn College develop a Center for Core Studies which, among its several initiatives, would sponsor an Associates-in-Residence Program and a Summer Associates Program. The former would permit Visitors to be on campus for an entire semester; the latter would permit Visitors to be on campus for the week in the summer during which Brooklyn College conducts its summer Faculty Development Seminar. Both programs would have the virtue of providing Visitors with an extended

opportunity to observe the core process at close range. Success of these one-year pilot initiatives would in large part determine the feasibility of proposing the formation of a "full-service" Center for Core Studies.

Obviously, it is essential in this report not to conflate a description and evaluation of the content of the Core Program itself with a description and evaluation of the two FIPSE-sponsored programs specifically to be covered by this report. It is, of course, tempting to dwell on the Core Program itself; however, that is outside the scope of the present evaluative report. On the other hand, it is impossible separate the core process from the activities to be evaluated in this report.

ASSOCIATES-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAM

Composition

Associates-in-Residence Program participants were selected from among a group of applicants ("alumni" of the Visitors Program) who submitted their applications in Fall 1987. Although this was (of necessity) somewhat short notice, the number and quality of applicants was highly gratifying. Five faculty members were provided an opportunity for full participation in "all aspects of curricular and institutional renewal." The following persons were invited to serve as Associates-in-Residence: Richard Fox (Suffolk Community College), Betsy Gitter (John Jay College), Thomas Juliusburger (University of Bridgeport), Joanne Reitano (LaGuardia Community College), and Sandra Vaughn (LeMoyne-Owen College).

Duties

Associates-in-Residence were expected to: attend and participate in the Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning, interact on a routine basis with Brooklyn College Core faculty, and, in most cases, teach one section of a core course--"observing in this way the entire core coordination network, core course seminars, faculty writing workshops, and other elements of the core process as it works itself out at the level of the individual course."

Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning

The Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning met weekly during the Spring 1988 semester. Seminar participants, consisting of Associates-in-Residence and selected Brooklyn College faculty were provided an extensive though flexible outline in advance of the seminar. Since few of the Associates resided near campus, this Seminar proved to be the principal occasion for routine interaction among Associates.

Part I of the Seminar dealt with the "intellectual foundations" of the Core Program. Participants were invited to formulate definitions of the term "liberal learning" and to deliberate on the contemporary case to be made for the renewal of liberal learning in the college curriculum. Readings for this part of the Seminar included: General Education in a Free Society and History of Liberal Arts Education.

Part II dealt with curriculum design and content. It specifically raised some of the objections and difficulties that thoughtful people have sometimes raised regarding a common core of studies. It dealt with the

benefits and limitations of the distribution area approach to liberal learning. Next it focused specifically on questions about the content of a liberal studies curriculum. Finally, it addressed the role of curricular coherence in liberal studies. Readings for this part of the Seminar included: To Reclaim a Legacy, Integrity in the College Curriculum, and Brooklyn College's Core Curriculum booklet.

All of the participants interviewed judged these first two sections to be highly valuable, although some were at first apprehensive about taking part in what they considered a highly theoretical discussion. However, part of the Core Process is getting people to think about, care about, and talk about the why's of curriculum. This in itself turned out to be a powerful faculty development opportunity for those who did not believe themselves endowed with a "speculative" turn of mind.

Part III dealt with the process of renewing liberal learning. This is perhaps the most important part of the Seminar. Getting people to think in terms of principles and to formulate academic policy on the basis of a clear articulation of what they take to be the objectives of a college education is what the core process, the life of the Core Program at Brooklyn College is all about. This part consisted of three sections: the process of creating a liberal studies curriculum; the process of implementing, reviewing, and revising a curriculum; and the process evaluating and reconsidering a program.

The first section of Part III dealt with questions such as: How can faculty leadership be energized to initiate an academic discussion of the

curriculum? What role can and must academic administrators play in the process? What works best in bringing about a critical mass of support for a new curriculum? How can faculty involvement in the "creation process" be enlarged and sustained? What "governance and support mechanisms" are most effective in overcoming obstacles and opening up new opportunities?

The second section of Part III dealt specifically with governance and faculty development in the area of research on teaching and learning: How can active learning be generated? How can students learn to be collaborative inquirers and critical thinkers? What teachings strategies work? How can the continuing vitality of the core be ensured? How can individual core courses best be monitored and improved? How can the overall coherence of the core program be enhanced?

The final section of Part III dealt with assessment: strategies for the assessment of the impact of the program on students, on faculty, on the major, on electives, and on life-long learning. It considered the resources and methodologies currently available for studying the effectiveness of a core program. Readings for this section included: A New Vitality in General Education.

Throughout the Seminar all participants, Brooklyn College faculty as well as Associates-in-Residence, were regularly encouraged to provide specific cases from their own experience which might help illuminate and direct the discussion. Associates-in-Residence were asked to provide detailed background information about their respective home institutions. This included an account of the aspirations and mission as well as the academic culture and politics of their home institutions. The lively and

continuous give-and-take among the Associates and between the Associates and the Brooklyn College faculty was highly prized. Brooklyn College faculty expressed themselves freely to the Associates about the strengths and weaknesses of the Core Program. In fact, the presence and contributions of Brooklyn College faculty proved for some Associates to have been the most significant part of the Seminar.

Considerable support for the Seminar was expressed by both Brooklyn College faculty as well as the Associates. Some Associates indicated that the Seminar could be strengthened in the future by asking Associates to prepare in advance a written account of the "basic facts" of their respective institutions, instead of taking up valuable Seminar time with potentially tedious oral presentations. There was also significant interest expressed by some Associates in using a case study approach to deliberating about curricular change; however, it was noted that greater profit might be derived from adopting a more formal approach to these case studies, with the case studies prepared and distributed in advance, and with Associates and Brooklyn College faculty forming small teams for the purpose of developing responses to these case studies.

Associates & the Core Courses

For a variety of reasons, not all of the Associates taught a core course. Those who did found it to be very challenging and very rewarding. This teaching opportunity was particularly gratifying to those whose home institution happened to be a community college; they reported that the discussion was stimulating and highly gratifying. Those teaching core

courses believed they received considerable help and support from the relevant department, especially from the department chair. They reported that they received old syllabi, booklists, study guides, and common examinations. Considerable informal discussion took place prior to the course. They also reported that they found the continuing informal interaction with departmental faculty to be invaluable in understanding the objectives of their particular core course.

It is essential to bear in mind Brooklyn College's core courses are not warmed over "101" courses. They were designed after the core structure was put into place, and reflect considerable corporate effort on the part of Brooklyn College faculty at producing courses that reflect the basic principles and objectives of the Core Program. Moreover, Brooklyn College faculty have come to acknowledge that students need to see that a particular core course can be interrelated with other core courses, with required skill courses, with courses in the major, and even with electives. Thanks to very specific advance coaching, Associates teaching a section of a first-tier core course were able to know in advance what to presume in the way of student preparation. Thus, substantive consultation between Associates and their home departments proved very critical.

Evaluation

All of those selected to be Associates-in-Residence Program for Spring 1988 participated in the Provost's Seminar for the Renewal of Liberal Learning and found it to be especially rewarding and stimulating. Participating Brooklyn College faculty also expressed great praise for the Seminar. The organization of the Seminar was outstanding; the order of Seminar

topics could easily and with great profit be exported for use at another institution. In addition to serving the obvious social purpose of simply bringing the Associates together on a regular basis, the Provost's Seminar challenged them, along with Brooklyn College faculty, to consider in a systematic way both the theoretical and practical aspects of curricular change. Exposure to the sheer variety of home institutions represented by the Associates-in-Residence ensured continuous learning and reflection. For example, thanks to the Seminar, faculty at four-year institutions (both Brooklyn College and the others represented by the Associates) learned a great deal about the mission and challenges of the community colleges--a subject about which they found they had surprisingly known so little beforehand.

Recommendation #1: The "theoretical" component of the Provost's Seminar should not be decreased or deleted.

Recommendation #2: Written material describing the "objective facts" about an Associate's home institution should be made available, in lieu of an oral presentation.

Recommendation #3: The case study approach to curricular change is an extraordinarily powerful tool. Its use in the Seminar should be refined and formalized.

Teaching a section of a core course also proved to be an extraordinarily rewarding experience for the Associates-in-Residence as well as for Brooklyn College faculty. This component of the program should definitely be continued.

Recommendation #1: Since core courses are very probably unlike courses that an Associate may have ever taught in the past, it might be appropriate for future Associates, well prior to their semester at Brooklyn College, to meet with appropriate faculty and administrators to get a feel for the nature and purpose of the course, for how the course might be integrated with other courses

in the core, and for the various academic support services that are available.

Recommendation #2: To maximize their classroom effectiveness, future Associates should be encouraged to make a regular practice of attending core courses other than their own when possible and meet regularly with faculty teaching other core courses as well as those teaching sections of their own. As a matter of regular routine, the relevant academic units should provide appropriate guidance and support for Associates throughout the semester, but particularly before and at the beginning of the semester.

Recommendation #3: Faculty development workshops for Departments about to house an Associate-in-Residence should be considered.

SUMMER ASSOCIATES PROGRAM

Composition

Brooklyn College faculty, in describing the success of the Core Program, have always highlighted the primal importance of the College's Summer Faculty Development Seminar as the sine qua non for successful curriculum implementation.

The purpose of the Summer Associates Program is to afford Visitors an opportunity to observe and participate in the Summer Faculty Development Seminar. In addition to attending the three-day Brooklyn College Faculty Development Seminar on the Core Program, Summer Associates met on the days immediately preceding and following this Seminar, thus making the Summer Associates Program a five-day program. Twelve Summer Associates were selected from among the more than two hundred "alumni" of the Visitors Program. They were: Rev. Thomas E. Chambers, C.S.C. (Our Lady of Holy Cross College), Anthony Colaianne (Virginia Tech), Donald A. Cress (Northern Illinois University), Richard Fox (Suffolk Community College), Robert J. Frankle (Memphis State University), Patricia Hennessey (Merrimack College), Howard Horowitz (Ramapo College), Patricia Silber (Marymount College), Manuel Schonhorn (Southern Illinois University), Bettie M. Smolansky

(Moravian College), Bruce R. Stam (Chemeketa Community College), and Jo Taylor (Wayne State College).

The 1988 Summer Associates First Day

The Provost's opening remarks to the Summer Associates were very frank and to the point. She touched upon what is good about the Core Program, what is in need of attention, and what has yet to be done. These opening remarks were followed by short presentations by three former chairpersons and the current chairperson of the Faculty Council Committee on the Core Curriculum. These presentations helped the Summer Associates place the Core Program in clear historical perspective, with a variety of faculty viewpoints being represented.

The Summer Associates and the Brooklyn College personnel in attendance then broke up into three groups of six in order to discuss what needed to be done at the Summer Associates' home institutions in order to create, implement, and maintain a core program. Each discussion group prepared a written report which was later shared with the larger group.

The final session of the day featured a presentation by members of the Faculty Development Seminar Planning Committee. The speakers sketched the general principles and instructional objectives of a typical core course. Following the presentation there was lively discussion of issues and alternatives.

The Faculty Development Seminar

1988 would mark the seventh Faculty Development Seminar at Brooklyn College. Although the number of participants had previously been set at sixty, there would be eighty-five participants at the 1988 Seminar, owing to the fact that, in addition to the sixty-three Brooklyn College faculty members in attendance, there were ten Brooklyn College students (also participants in the Peer Tutor Program) and twelve Summer Associates. Some initial apprehension was expressed that perhaps the nature and dynamics of the Seminar would be changed, given the large size of the Seminar and the presence of students and outsiders. However, this apprehension was largely dispelled after a very short time. The mix turned out to be quite stimulating, and the strategy of rotating people through small discussion groups throughout the Seminar proved to be a highly effective means of getting people to mingle and to get to know one another.

Participants in the Faculty Development Seminar received a detailed program outlining the activities of the Seminar and containing several lists of participants and acknowledging those involved in the preparation of the Seminar.

The Provost, who served simultaneously as a member of the core faculty and as project director for the grant that funded the Faculty Development Seminars, opened the Faculty Development Seminar with a welcoming address entitled "Core Curriculum Crossroads: 1988-89." This address proved to be quite extraordinary in that it did so many things so well all at once. In effect, the Provost invited Brooklyn College faculty to "celebrate" the Core: to recall the times which were anything but perfect during which the

Core came into being and how faculty and administration alike had suffered through those painful times; to recall how the Brooklyn College community brought the Core Program into being; to recall what had been achieved and why it was done the way it was; to recall why it worked and continues to work (enough form to hold together, enough flexibility to bend); to recall recent initiatives such as student peer mentoring and faculty mentoring; to review the major points of the recently completed internal study on the Core Program (known as the Raskin-Owen Report). There followed an acknowledgement by name of those who performed critical tasks that might otherwise have gone unnoticed. Throughout the address the focus was on the acknowledgement, the celebration of change, revitalization and renewal--past, present and future. The Provost's address was followed by a brief "orientation to tasks and events" by the Chair of the Seminar Planning Committee.

Eight students delivered presentations based on their experience as peer tutors in the Core Program. This provided fresh insight into the Core and opened up new areas for what proved to be very lively discussion.

The afternoon of the first day of the Faculty Development Seminar was devoted to a long, hard look at Core Course 9 (Studies in African, Asian, and Latin American Cultures). Although previous Faculty Development Seminars had also addressed Core 9, additional impetus was given to revisiting Core 9 by the Raskin-Owen Report, which stated that, while Core 9 had helped students to increase their understanding of and respect for people with backgrounds different from their own, the course nevertheless seemed to suffer from a certain lack the coherence and clearness of purpose.

Two faculty members provided "samplers" based on their own handling of Core 9. This was followed by a presentation (always accompanied by much interaction with the audience) by four faculty members who focused clearly and directly on what each perceived to be the chief problems with Core 9. Participants then formed small groups to discuss the problem of bringing greater coherence to Core 9. Workshop reports were presented to the plenary group.

The second day of the Faculty Development Seminar dealt with Core 7 (Science in Modern Life: Chemistry/Physics) and Core 8 (Science in Modern Life: Biology/Geology). Unlike Core 9, Core 7 and Core 8 did not seem to have a problem with coherence or purpose. The focus rather was on developing effective teaching models. The participants divided into smaller groups to identify the strengths and weaknesses of alternative teaching models and to suggest and justify changes in the structure of the science courses. Again the small groups reported their findings to the plenary group.

The morning of the third day focused on "writing as one way to understanding, with two "samplers" from Core 10 (Knowledge, Existence, and Values) and Core 5 (Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning and Computer Programming). Participants then broke into smaller groups in order to discuss a pre-assigned specific Core course, the role of writing in that course, and other means of achieving the goals of the course. Specifically, each group was charged with defining and identifying the skills that are considered appropriate for the course. Again the small groups reported

their findings to the plenary group.

The afternoon session of the third day began with a Core 1 (Classical Origins of Western Culture) "sampler." There followed a discussion of whether in practice the Core is in danger of becoming an end point of obstacle to be overcome, rather than a starting point for better preparation in the major, lifelong learning, and solid career preparation. Small groups were asked to determine if there are significant barriers that limit the Core as a starting point for lifelong learning, and to list three changes that would enhance the Core's ability to meet its goal of serving as a starting point for lifelong learning. Again the small groups reported their findings to the plenary group. Following a discussion period the Faculty Development Seminar was concluded.

The morning of the final day of the Summer Associates Seminar focused on assessment. Associates heard a tape of a talk on assessment delivered by Robert L. Hess, President of Brooklyn College, at the 1988 Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges. Following discussion of President Hess' talk was a presentation on the "assessment movement" by one of the Summer Associates, which was followed by considerable discussion. Shortly thereafter the Summer Associates Seminar was concluded.

Evaluation

The Summer Associates Program is a highly effective means of providing Visitors with a sustained look at the human dimension of the core process. It was an exceptional opportunity for Visitors to see faculty development in action. The presence of the student peer tutors provided a unique and

valuable perspective on the Core that simply could not have been achieved without them. It can only be hoped that Brooklyn College faculty found this opportunity to be as useful to them as it was to the Summer Associates.

Recommendation: The Summer Associates Program should definitely be replicated for future Summer Associates. It is an outstanding opportunity for both faculty and administrators of other institutions.

General Comments

Anxiety about the curricular process sometimes proves unproductive and leads to time not well spent. We have all heard pretty presentations at higher education meetings in which everything is presented as moving along swimmingly at the speaker's home institution--where faculty dissent is nonexistent, where costs are known and manageable. We often leave these sessions feeling guilty that we at our own institutions have not made so much progress, but also simultaneously perplexed by our inability to quite believe what we had just heard. Later we feel tempted to call a few department chairs at the speaker's home institution to get the "real story."

Some of us have acted as if we thought that by going to enough meetings on general education and/or assessment, or by reading enough of the relevant literature on these matters, somehow the gods will look kindly on such displays of sincerity by telling us "the secret" of curricular change. Deep down we should all realize that it really does not work this way. There is no ancient secret, no trick, no easy formula for energizing the unenergized or leading those who do not want to be led.

Brooklyn College does not hide anything behind a facade of sweetness and light for the benefit of the Visitors; it is anything but a controlled or orchestrated environment. Nor, for that matter, is it hiding any magic formulas for success. What you see is what there is. Faculty members straightforwardly show their enthusiasm and their apprehension about the Core. They speak to particular areas of pride and concern. *People who are* highly critical of the Core are not hidden away; they are given a forum and allowed full opportunity to state their views; they are brought fully into the process. The Core process is not over at Brooklyn College; with luck, it never will be. Were the Core process to end at Brooklyn College, so too would the Core. Perhaps the most important part of the Core, at least for the faculty, is the Core process. Brooklyn College faced severe financial difficulties during the late 70's and early 80's. Yet it did and could go forward with the core. It brought faculty together to discuss a singularly important and significant matter, which for most faculty members is the reason they took up the academic life in the first place.

Visitors can master the basic structure and content of the ten courses comprising the Core Program in a comparatively short period; two days seemed quite appropriate for that. However, Brooklyn College reported that participants in the Visitors Program had suggested that a longer term, more intensive immersion in the "life" of the Core Program be a possibility for interested parties. What this suggests is that the process is indeed the heart of the Core Program; but observing the details of that process takes considerably more than two days. If there is a "secret," it is learned in closely observing the day-to-day process of discussion, administrative

leadership and support, discussion, emotional investment, and still more discussion. For this reason, the Associates-in-Residence Program and the Summer Associates Program should by all means be continued.

The Center for Core Studies

Recent surveys have shown that the vast majority of colleges and universities are reexamining their general education programs, with an eye both to quality and to coherence. It is also clear that there needs to be a centralized location for information, advice and support to give direction and encouragement to these curricular initiatives. It is therefore appropriate that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a national Center for Core Studies.

Brooklyn College has achieved a national reputation as a model for general education/core studies. NEH's To Reclaim a Legacy (1984), Ernest Boyer's College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (1986), and Edwin Delattre's Education and the Public Trust (1988), to name just a few resources, are articulate witnesses to the continuing reputation for excellence that Brooklyn College enjoys. Brooklyn College, in virtue of its status as a faculty development success story and as a leading proponent of the Core, is ideally suited to house such a Center. Its Associates-in-Residence and Summer Associates Programs have proved to be highly successful. They permitted colleagues from other institutions to see what many "alumni" of the Visitors Program wished they too could have seen: the core process, up close and over a protracted period. I strongly endorse the formation of (and support for) a Center for Core Studies at Brooklyn College.

This report prepared by:

Donald A. Cress
Department of Philosophy
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

(815)-753-0331